

JAN 3 1916

AMERICA

A CATHOLIC REVIEW OF THE WEEK

VOL. XIV, No. 12
WHOLE No. 351

JANUARY 1, 1916

PRICE, 10 CENTS
\$3.00 A YEAR**CHRONICLE**

Home News: America's Trade—Municipal Governments. The War: Bulletin, Dec. 21, p. m. Dec. 28, a. m.—The Second Note to Austria. France: The Academy Awards. Great Britain: Need of Munition Workers—Another Million of Men. Ireland: The Irish Party and Retrenchment. Mexico: Religion; Misery. Russia: The Duma. Spain: A Catholic Congress. 265-268

TOPICS OF INTEREST

The Mirror of Novels—III—The Boys of New Orleans—Capital Punishment: Some Objections—Automobilia—The Sources of Modern Achievement269-275

COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. Moore and Transubstantiation—Woman Suf-

frage—Mr. Moore and Papal Supremacy—Social Work for Women—Well-Directed Charity. 275-277

EDITORIALS

No Room—Poverty and Character—The Empty Grotto—The Annual Bacchanalia—Hypnotism for Inebriates—Our Re-Resolutions—Easy Writing278-281

LITERATURE

How to Collect a Library.

REVIEWS: La Psychologie de la Conversion—Belgian Poems—Belgium's Agony—The Greatest of Literary Problems—Schools of Tomorrow—The School and Society—The New International Encyclopedia.

BOOKS AND AUTHORS: "Memories and Anecdotes"—"Critical Essays of the Eighteenth Century, 1700-

1725"—"The Secret Bequest"—"David Penstephen"—"An Enclosed Nun"—The December Studies—A Little Book on the Value of Faith—Meditations on the Passion of Our Lord—"Spindrift"—"More Jonathan Papers,"...281-284

EDUCATION

Mooted Points in the Gary Plan.....285, 286

SOCIOLOGY

Brothers in the Dust.....286, 287

NOTE AND COMMENT

Notes on Priests in Italy—Causes of Death—Inspiration for Protestant Pulpits—Practical Managers for Catholic Institutions—The Abbot of Caldey's School for Boys—The Purpose of the Bureau of Education.....287, 288

CHRONICLE

Home News.—A recent bulletin of the Department of Commerce gives some interesting data about our trade. November imports were \$164,319,169, an increase of

America's Trade \$11,000,000 over the previous November record made in 1912. November exports were valued at \$331,144,527, the greatest of any month in the country's history. The best previous month was last October, when the exports were \$328,030,281. The twelve months' imports to November 30 aggregate \$1,730,243,229 against \$1,858,645,027 for the preceding year. The year's exports are estimated at \$3,437,292,533 or \$1,500,000,000 more than the preceding year, and about \$1,000,000,000 more than two years ago. Some \$61,000,000 in gold arrived last November; \$7,000,000 reached the country in November, 1914. The twelve months' imports of gold totaled \$410,650,976, compared with \$58,352,035 in 1914. November exports of gold were valued at \$3,661,153 against \$14,526,482 in the preceding November. Last year gold to the amount of \$19,667,557 left America as compared with \$233,057,825 the year before. The inward gold movement during the last twelve months was \$390,983,419; the outward movement the year before was \$174,705,790. The total foreign trade for 1915 was about \$5,000,000,000.

The Boston *Evening Transcript* summarizes a report, "General Statistics of Cities, 1915," soon to be issued by the Census Bureau Department of Commerce. The

Municipal Governments

commission form of government is in effect in 81 cities of the 294 cities of over 30,000 inhabitants. Of these 5 are in New England, 27 in other Northern States east of the Mississippi, 16 in Northern States between the Missis-

issippi and the Pacific Coast States, 9 in the Pacific Coast States and 24 in the South. The largest cities under a commission are New Orleans with a population of some 365,000, and Buffalo, which recently voted to inaugurate the system January 1, 1916, with a population of about 460,000. Next in order are Washington, D. C., 350,000 people; Portland, Oregon, 260,000 inhabitants, and Denver with about 250,000. The commissions range in size from three to seven members, with terms of office ranging from one to four years. The salaries vary from \$500, as in Jackson, Michigan, and Springfield, Ohio, to \$7,000 a year, as in Birmingham, Alabama. Most large cities cling to the older form of government; in all, 213 large cities have the older form. The mayor's term of office ranges from one to four years; the salary from \$100 a year, as in Flint, Michigan, to \$15,000 a year, as in New York. A notable fact is the increase of police-women; they are employed in 26 cities. Chicago has 21; Baltimore, Los Angeles and Seattle, 5 each; Pittsburgh, 4; San Francisco, Portland, Oregon, and St. Paul, 3 each; Dayton, Topeka, and Minneapolis, 2 each; fifteen other cities have one each. The wage paid these women ranges from \$625 a year, as in Dayton, to \$1,200, as in San Francisco. Of the 294 cities of over 30,000 inhabitants 115 have municipally owned water-supply systems, constructed at a value of \$1,071,000,000. Philadelphia is a pioneer in this respect; its system was inaugurated in 1801. In the last mentioned cities there are 36,936 miles of water mains, 330,593 fire hydrants, and 1,787,448 meters. Last year 1,326,028,000,000 gallons of water—enough to cover Connecticut to a depth of nearly sixteen inches—were supplied to 26,200,000 people, quite a sufficient per capita allowance. In some cities 25 per cent of the water used was metered; statistics from such cities show that the per capita daily

consumption is lowest in Savannah, in prohibition Georgia, 43 gallons, and highest in Tacoma, 430 gallons.

The War.—During the week the French launched a vigorous attack against the German positions in the Vosges and succeeded in making a considerable advance, especially at Hartmannsweilerkopf; *Bulletin, Dec. 21, p. later, however, they were forced to*
m.-Dec. 28, a. m. yield to the Germans a large portion of the ground so gained. In the vicinity of Dvinsk the Russians claim some minor successes. In Montenegro and Albania the Austrians and Bulgarians are reported to have been checked. On the Greek-Serbian boundary, after a period of complete inactivity, operations, according to an unofficial dispatch from Athens, have been renewed, at least by German heavy artillery. The bombardment of the French first line positions is taken to be the preliminary step toward a strong movement against the Allies at Salonica. An unconfirmed report stated that the Russians had attacked and captured Varna, on the Black Sea coast, and landed a large invading force on Bulgarian territory. This statement seems to have been premature. Following up the withdrawal of the British troops from Suvla and Anzac, the Turks renewed their attack against the Allies at the tip of the Gallipoli peninsula, but failed to accomplish anything of importance. The situation in the Trentino and along the Isonzo remains unchanged.

The second note to Austria, when made public, was found to be substantially the same as the first; but it is notably less harsh in tone and omits all reference to the correspondence which has passed between Germany and the United States. It refuses, however, to discuss

*The Second Note
to Austria*

the circumstances of the sinking of the Ancona, and claims that the report of the incident transmitted to our State Department by the Austro-Hungarian Admiralty is "sufficient to fix upon the commander of the submarine which fired the torpedo the responsibility for having wilfully violated the recognized law of nations and entirely disregarded those humane principles which every belligerent should observe in the conduct of war at sea." The note holds two things as established, the culpability of the commander, and the loss, injury or jeopardy of American lives resulting from his lawless act. Assuming these two facts as indisputable, and taking for granted that the Imperial and Royal Government neither questions nor disputes the universally recognized and manifestly right and just principles on which the United States bases her action, Mr. Lansing sees no need for debate, but declares that the United States holds the Austrian Government responsible for the act of its naval commander and renews the former demands. The communication ends with the expression of the hope entertained by the United States

that the foregoing statement of its position will enable the Imperial and Royal Government to perceive the justice of those

demands and to comply with them in the same spirit of frankness and with the same concern for the good relations now existing between the United States and Austria-Hungary which prompted the Government of the United States to make them.

The general character of the note, and in particular the mildness of the last paragraph, have been noted and favorably commented on in Vienna, while the Hungarian Premier is optimistic about the outcome of the dispute; it is believed that the way is now paved for an understanding between the two nations; but the reported loss of an American life when the Japanese steamship, Yasaka Maru, was torpedoed in the Mediterranean, a matter which is now under investigation, if found true, may complicate the issue.

France.—In the last session of the French Academy, M. Hanotaux, speaking officially for his fellow members, announced the awards of the *prix de vertu*, given annually under the Montyon and similar foundations, to those who distinguish themselves by some act of

*The Academy
Awards*

charity or heroism. These awards are eagerly awaited and afford a fair test of public opinion. The Academy gave three of its more important prizes to the various societies known as the "French Red Cross"; 8,000 francs from the Montyon fund to the "Wounded Soldiers' Aid," 8,000 francs from the Sussy foundation to the association known as "The Ladies of France" and 8,000 francs from the Broquette-Gonin Fund to the "Frenchwomen's Union." M. Hanotaux singled out for special praise, Sister des Garets of the Daughters of Charity, who is hailed by the French people as the heroine of Reims; the Catholic schoolmaster Salette, killed at the front; Paulin Enfert, the "Father of the Poor" in the thirteenth Paris Ward; "the blackcap philosophers," as the people call the Sisters who continue the charitable works of Abbé Rambaud, and lastly the "Jeanne-d'Arc-Ste.-Clotilde Societies" for the relief of orphans, poor girls, etc., so nobly directed by Sister Delaage of the Daughters of Charity. For various acts of heroism and for generous and efficient relief work the following awards were made: 900 francs to Abbé Dumont, 1,000 francs to the "Popular Catholic Library Association," and 1,000 francs to Mother Zén-aïde, Superioress of the Sisters of Providence of Cluny. M. Etienne Lamy read the Academy's report of the prizes for literature. This year honors were conferred on the distinguished writers who died fighting for France. Here again while the Academy honored such pessimists as Paul Acker and Jacques Neyral, it reserved its warmest tribute for Henry de Roure, who proclaimed faith as the one solution of the modern riddle; and for such thoroughly Catholic writers as François Laurentie, Charles Péguy, Ernest Psichari and Abbé Léon Vouaux, who died "with his eyes fixed upon his breviary and his crucifix." Catholics the world over can be proud of this roll-call. It is a consoling sign that the Academy officially recognizes these heroes.

Great Britain.—Speaking in the House of Commons, Lloyd George again repeated that the success of the Allies depends upon the willingness of organized labor to allow the Government to recruit unskilled men for the munition works. "The whole question," said the Minister, "depends upon this willingness. Unless we are allowed to put unskilled laborers on work which has been the monopoly of skilled labor, we cannot perform our task. Victory depends upon this. Hundreds of thousands of precious lives hang on labor's answer."

We have done our best to get skilled labor by the system of munition volunteers. It is of no use for me to go into the story of why we got only five or six thousand men, though that is a story that may have to be told later. We want eighty thousand skilled men and from two to three hundred thousand unskilled men for new factories. We must reduce the proportion of orders which go abroad and develop our home resources. Upon this depends whether we can supply our troops with the right sort of guns and make next year's campaign a success.

According to the *Daily Chronicle*: "No more moving peroration has been heard for many a long year in the House of Commons: 'Let not "Too late" be inscribed on the portals of our workshops.'" The speech is, in the opinion of the *Chronicle*, "a damning indictment of the War Office."

The House has acceded to the Premier's request for another million of troops. Mr. Asquith intimated that unless the number of men enrolled under Lord Derby's

**Another Million
of Men**

plan fully met all expectations, conscription might yet be enforced. Mr. John Redmond at once announced his determination to oppose this policy by every possible means, and was joined by leaders of the Labor Party, although C. B. Stanton, successor to the late leader, Keir Hardie, declared that "if the men would not volunteer they should be brought to the colors." Mr. Redmond pointed out that in no case had the recent failures been due to lack of men, and intimated that a change in governmental policy might meet the needs of the situation more aptly than further drafts. There can be little doubt that dissatisfaction with the Coalition Cabinet is growing daily. Much opposition to the Premier and to Sir Edward Grey has developed, and fundamental changes may take place in the immediate future.

Ireland.—Not long since a "Retrenchment Committee" was appointed in connection with Irish economies, for the purpose of cutting down expenditures in Ireland,

**The Irish Party and
Retrenchment**

in the interest of the Imperial Exchequer. This action raised effective protest from influential papers like the *Independent* and *New Ireland*. The latter pointed out that the contemplated reductions of expenditure at the present time were of trifling importance in comparison with the bearing of the retrenchment proposals upon the financial provisions of the Home Rule Act. It there-

fore urged the Irish Party to obtain a pledge from the Prime Minister that no Irish economies should be made prejudicial to the success of that Act. For Irish taxpayers would obtain little or no relief from the present savings, but would be heavily burdened with Imperial contributions. These would seriously hamper the Irish Party in any scheme of national development. The Under-Secretary, Sir Mathew Nathan, admitted that economies made in Ireland would directly benefit the Imperial Government and afford no relief to Irish taxpayers. In a reply to Mr. Healy, Mr. Birrell stated that "any such reduction in the net expenditure would inure to the benefit of the Exchequer." The protest and agitation against the Committee were based on the fact that, were the retrenchments made, "there was every likelihood that the most obvious savings in the cost of Irish Government would have been effected before Home Rule came into operation and the Irish Party would lose forever the benefit of the economies on which it must largely depend for its success." These protests against the Committee and Sir Mathew Nathan, who is thought responsible for it, had their effect. Though, together with Mr. Birrell, Sir John Lonsdale and Mr. Walter Kavanagh continued to act as members of the committee, Mr. John Boland, M.P., suddenly withdrew from it at Mr. Redmond's personal request. Mr. Redmond himself wrote the following note to Mr. Birrell:

I regret very much that the decision to switch on the retrenchment inquiry from Great Britain into Ireland was come to without any consultation whatever with the Irish Party, and the case has been made worse by the fact that we were not consulted about Irishmen who have been added to the Committee. The work of the Committee will raise exceedingly difficult and complicated questions, and under all the circumstances I have felt it best to advise the Irish Party not to nominate any representatives on the Committee and to leave themselves free to deal with any recommendation that the Committee may make.

New Ireland praises the tone and attitude of the letter, but criticizes "the Irish Party's methods of working continually behind the scenes," and regrets that in such a vital issue they acted so tardily and apparently on the suggestion of their political foes.

Mexico.—Religion is still in a sad way in Mexico. Three letters have recently come to hand detailing accounts of savage persecutions. Two of the communica-

tions deal with acts committed in **Religion; Misery** Puebla, December 7, as follows:

The local Government has closed the following churches: *la Compañia, el Carmen, Nuestra Señora de la Luz, San Pedro, San Ildefonso, San Christobal and la Concordia*, and has ordered an inventory to be made of everything contained in each church. In *la Compañia* they expected to find great treasures, but discovered nothing save old statues and a few candlesticks. Religious persecution is fiercer than ever; four priests have been imprisoned. Yesterday there was a public demonstration by some 3,000 women, who marched to the Governor's palace and demanded liberty of worship, guarantees for Catholics, and that the churches be restored to worship.

The Governor concealed himself and sent his secretary to interview the ladies. . . . There is to be another demonstration, but I fear no lasting good will come of it, for this persecution is the result of a well-set plan. Even now officials are on the look-out for more priests.

The second letter reads in part as follows:

All that you say about religious persecution in Yucatan is quite true, and since the recognition of Carranza this persecution has increased to a terrible degree. After the looting of the Cathedral on September 24, this venerable building, more than three centuries old, remained closed. And sad to say the work of destruction has been continued by the Government. The interior of the building has been still further stripped: the sacristy has been demolished, as also one of the chapels wherein many were buried. Not even the dead have been respected. The rural priests are concentrated in town; the whole State, save Merida, is absolutely deprived of religious services; the sick are dying without absolution, the children without baptism. The priests are being expelled gradually. This is the way the religious liberty guaranteed by Carranza is granted.

The New York *Sun* of December 26 contained a very remarkable article on Mexico by an American long resident in Mexico City. The *Sun* itself gives this synopsis of the article:

Sixteen radical changes in government were seen in the city in the five years of revolution, each one as bad as the other. Wholesale liberation of prisoners went with each one, and each faction went away leaving behind a trail of bad money. Prices have risen and risen until now they cannot go any higher, and the Carranza Government is trying to force them down. Stocks have been running low. Idleness, strikes, disease and lack of medicines have nearly put the finishing touches on the desolation of the city. The Constitutional officers, or most of them, in control of Mexico at the present time, are a carousing, venturesome, fighting crowd, who know no peaceful pursuit. Most of them have no education. Textile factories, one of Mexico's richest industries, have been destroyed or shut down for a long period. Sugar and mine properties are not being worked in full. Crops have been confiscated and little planting has been done. The Carranza authorities have been active in forcing the banks to guarantee their notes with currency. Foreign capital is no friend of Carranza because of his many decrees. Many new kinds of taxes have been clapped on or are planned, as Carranza is desperately in need of funds. The saloons have not obeyed the decree to move, paying heavy tribute to stay where they are.

The *Sun*, no doubt, will further elucidate conditions in future issues.

Russia.—Recent press dispatches reporting that the Czar had allowed the Duma to convene, make pertinent the reason which brought on the dissolution of

The Duma the last assembly. This reason lies in the nature of the reforms demanded, as follows: (1) The autonomy of Poland. (2) Amnesty for political prisoners. (3) Full civil privileges for Jews and removal of restrictions concerning their residence in Russia itself. (4) Removal of all disabilities under which workmen labor; recognition of the right to organize trade unions, etc. (5) Appointment of a special Minister of Munitions and of a munition committee. (6) A liberal policy in

regard to Finland. (7) Emancipation of commerce from restrictions. (8) Alteration in the arrangements for the exportation of wheat from southern Russia, and changes in the rates of exchange.

The immediate inauguration of these reforms was demanded; a further request was made that the subjoined concessions be granted at the end of the war: (1) A legislative body elected by universal male suffrage. (2) The reform of existing schools, the establishment of secular and elementary schools, a system of free government for the universities. (3) The autonomy of Siberia and Caucasus. (4) Reforms in the church, which included restriction of the powers of the Synod and the restoration of the Patriarch. (5) The reform of municipal administrations so as to curtail the power of land-owners. (6) The restriction of the powers of local Governors in such a way as to make the Governor more amenable to the Minister of the Interior. (7) Restriction of the powers of the Upper House known as the Council of the Empire. (8) A reform by which the Ministers could be made more responsive to popular needs and could be called to strict account for their official acts. (9) Liberty of the press, of speech, and of assembly, as outlined in the manifestoes of October, 1905, and April, 1915. (10) Agrarian reforms and greater encouragement for agriculture. (11) A new commercial treaty with Germany, so drawn as to protect Russian industries, or in lieu of this a tariff sufficient to protect Russian industries.

Spain.—Valladolid gave a cordial welcome to the 103 Catholic syndicates or unions gathered for the inauguration of the new social center of the various Catholic associations of the Province. After *A Catholic Congress* solemn religious ceremonies in the Cathedral and the blessing by the Bishop of Salamanca of the buildings dedicated to the cause of labor and Catholic social action, some 8,000 associates listened to the stirring address of the Bishop of Jaca. The speaker contrasted the fallacies and wild dreams of Socialism with the sound ideals and purposes of Catholic organized labor, the license of Socialism ultimately leading to anarchy, while the true liberty of the Catholic system ever remained obedient to the voice of reason and the teaching of Christ.

After a series of instructive conferences, the following resolutions were adopted: To settle upon a just and decent standard of wages for agricultural laborers and to see that it be maintained; to obtain for farm-hands and laborers a certain percentage of the profit made from the harvest; to devise a system of small loans at a nominal interest, thus enabling the laborers to acquire gradually small lots of land; to hire out at the lowest possible rates necessary farm implements and machinery. The Association also recommended insurance against accidents and enforced idleness in slack seasons, for sickness and old age.

TOPICS OF INTEREST

The Mirror of Novels

IF the novels of a country are the mirrors in which it sees itself, certainly Miss Columbia has reason to groan. Folly and wickedness are stamped all over her face; here and there a livid scar intensifies ugliness into horror.

However, mirrors may be false: some exaggerate, others minimize. Many are cracked; more lack the right quantity of quicksilver. But all reflect an element, however small, of truth. Columbia could not do better than consider just how true the mirror of her novels is; and, if she finds that it actually reflects her as she really is, she should waste little time sighing, but immediately begin to spend much in improving.

Yet a brief investigation into the American literary world, suffices to indicate that our novels are not an altogether accurate index to our national *morale*. Truth has somehow ceased to stand as a literary objective; sensation has come to be the demand of our pace-setting publishers. The novelist seizes upon some "peculiar phase of public life," pinches it like a nose, until it is distorted into unnatural bigness and prominence; result, a "best seller." Of course fiction has a right to be fiction; but surely it has no license to be a national fisticuff. Fact must not be blown out, that the flame of fancy may burn more brilliantly. To be sure, it would make little difference whether novels used fact or not; but it makes all the difference in the world when they offer fancy for fact. Many of them do. And, when they do not, many readers believe they do. Frequently the loud voice of fiction fills the country with alarm over some hitherto unnoticed civil or social ailment; a fervid examination is instituted; just to make excitement a little brisker, the women's magazines rave; in courtesy, the men's journals declare that "it is inconceivable that such and such a terrible state of affairs as that so effectually uncovered by Mrs. So-and-so's graphic book could have gone on for so long in such a supposedly civilized country as ours." At this juncture, a new novel from a rival publisher, with a brand new problem or topic, is bound to be skipping from the press to the people. Naturally an entirely new excitement is demanded, and secured. The first agitation is forgotten as quickly as the second is aroused. Thus Columbia, led by persons who receive pay ranging from one to ten cents a word, is getting nowhere, except into a state of nervous prostration.

Certainly the great demerit of the American novel is brutal frankness, spiritual sickness, sensationalism. In this country, we are fond of the constellation system: few of us care to visit a theater where no particular star is twinkling; our national game admits only acknowledged stars on its chief diamonds; in literary circles stars, notoriously brilliant, or brilliantly notorious, are

alone conceded discussion. Such luminaries are the object of a most generous cult: we can never get enough of their sparkling, and consequently feed them with gold enough to gorge the health out of any genius. Small wonder that stars are loath to cease their shining, even when every shining gift which nature gave them has burned out! No wonder at all that many hands which could work excellently with humble tools are attracted to the romantic pen! There is such a thing in the world as artificial radiance, you know: kerosene, electricity, acetylene. Figuratively, it is in such cheap and glaring glows that the decadent author, the lazy man who finds it so much easier to write about vice than virtue, and the ambitious tyro who unable to distinguish between fame and infamy, essays to step into notice over night, clothe themselves in order to retain or gain the favor of a not too discriminating public. This is one reason why so many shocking plays are catapulted into our cities: the shock, you see, serves to carry along a star, too old, indolent, or young, to carry itself along. Similarly, many of our authors, with their best talent beginning or asleep or gone, produce books which are bombs of sensation. Inevitably these bombs burst; and the writer, ready for his literary cradle, couch, or coffin, is violently and briefly, but pleasantly and profitably withal, landed on the counters of the leading book-shops. The indecency, which is generally the secret of sensationalism, would be too disgusting to gain many votaries or elude the law, were it not represented as some "serious issue" or "vital principle" which must needs be frankly faced and taken into account by our nation. Take for example the heroine of one of our popular stories. This young lady, standing in moral mud up to her slender waist, and holding in giddy leash the destinies of several male admirers, should be whipped; but the author, after trailing her all over the dirty side of New York, deposits her, clean and fresh, at the domestic hearth. And the excuse offered for this sordid story of a feather-weight brain, a pair of gold stockings, a baby face and an appetite for lobster *à la* Newburgh, is sociological! We are implicitly asked to believe, in the introduction to this novel, that the heroine is merely a representative of modern female unrest. The American girl of today, we are told, sees no reason why she should not have as much license to go behind the scenes of "life" as her brother. Gay Gotham calls to her and she comes. To taste evil? Oh, no; just to play with it. Led by evil? Ah, no; only by the new and broad spirit of our country and century. And thus the foolish, world-old, sinful craving of Eve in the heroine, to taste the forbidden fruit, is nobly mistranslated as a great sociological urge. The heroine is pictured as quite innocent, even when she deliberately snuggles into the embrace of another woman's husband; sociology and not the heroine, you see, is doing the snuggling. When she indignantly refuses marriage, preferring a romance too big to fit into the little old-fashioned conventional wedding-ring, sociology, not the heroine, you understand, does the re-

fusing and the preferring. So, under the caption of social science, a particularly nasty dish of immorality is served up to us. And, instead of resenting the mess, we accept it absolutely as an interesting, clever, and instructive setting forth of a genuine aspect of our civilization.

Then there is an extreme serial, a story about a woman with an atmosphere which, as Archbishop Spalding would probably say, could not be "expurgated" but ought to be "exorcised." An editorial, "boosting" this abomination, calls it a modern "Inferno" which vividly reveals the human hell of today just as Dante Alighieri depicted that which existed in the dull medieval mind. Here immorality is piously presented to us as an "arraignment of our civilization." Imagine the devil in ministerial robes! Needless to predict, this story will be eagerly devoured by the lady whose eyes are dreamily watery, whose head is generally full of Swinburne and whose stomach is seldom empty of Huyler's.

It is plain to see, unless one wills to blind himself, that the authors of these Fourth-of-July tomes stuff them, not with the truths which universally obtain in our country, for these would be too commonplace to make much of a report, but rather with the powder of their own personal emotions, experiences, and imaginations. It is a salacious, consequently salable, aspect of Columbia which they depict, rather than Columbia as she mostly is. It is more often the sores of their own souls, than those of Columbia, which they uncover. In a word, today, authors are being enriched for posing before the public, spiritually naked.

It certainly seems that the more decent-minded among us should protest against this indecency. Sh-sh! hisses Elizabeth Woodbridge, writer in the *Yale Review*. It is because your artistic perceptions are undeveloped that you shrink from the "spiritual nude in art." Perchance 'tis so; but, somehow, it would be hard for any artist, however modern or futuristic, to see aught but ugliness in a picture of a tumor or cancer. We would complain, not so much because our authors paint the naked soul, as because they persist in verbally etching its hideous moral excrescences and diseases. Thank God the spirit of America is not sick beyond recovery, though our novels would lead Europe to believe it.

Hardly any of these rapidly appearing literary explosives raise anybody but their authors. They reveal us wallowing in the mire and help us to stay there. It cannot be gainsaid that our country has its social scars. But certain truths must be kept in view. First, that these disfigurements will gain no permanent remedy from a lurid exposure by romanticists, fonder of effect than fact. Secondly, that the essay which exposes vices, not as new and unique developments of any civilization but as real human defects not younger nor more extraordinary than Eden, and which proposes the proper and only initial remedy, religion, for them, is the more correct medium for their treatment; and not the novel which renders sin physiological, sociological, tyrannical, sympathy-pro-

voking, attractive, in a word, anything except sinful. Thirdly, that if our fiction would only lay more stress on the virtues of our country, readers would be stimulated to love and increase those virtues.

One picks up a new book for honest relaxation, and feels like a criminal before he has finished ten pages. All our heroes and heroines have become villains. In the Sodom of our fast literary world, would it be possible to find even ten just novels?

So long has the reading public been a stranger to the wife who really loves her husband, the youth whose heart is gold, the maiden whose soul is a pearl, and the broad, clean meadow fragrant with new-mown hay, that their return would really cause a bigger sensation, and remuneration, than the vilest story which publishers seem to be so eagerly seeking.

EDWARD F. MURPHY, M.A.

III—The Boys of New Orleans

WE mean the Catholic boys that are poor. They deserve all our sympathy, and are in need of all the assistance we can give them. The dangers to their Faith are numerous. The actual loss of this, their most precious treasure in life, their apparently unavoidable drifting away from the Church, is a matter of anxious concern to those who by Divine Providence have been appointed their brothers' keepers. It is wrong to assign poverty in itself as the only cause of their spiritual distress. Poverty is not incompatible with strong Catholic convictions. Indeed experience would go to prove that unshaken confidence in God and sincere resignation to the ruling of Divine Providence, are virtues thriving in the atmosphere of the poor, more commonly than in the homes of the rich. On the other hand, it has frequently been pointed out that wealth is responsible for much of the indifference that exists towards the Catholic Church and for much of the rebellious attitude against her rights and her claims. Whilst all this is true, it is nevertheless also true that poverty, with its privations and sufferings and hardships has brought about a strange combination of circumstances that are closely linked with loss of Faith in a great number of our Catholic young men. We will set forth these circumstances as clearly and as fairly as we can, as they exist in one city that is predominantly Catholic.

A little more than a year ago, his Excellency, Governor Hall of Louisiana appointed a committee to investigate the labor conditions of the poor in the city of New Orleans. Mr. S. M. Hartzman was named the director of the committee. On October 5, 1914, he made public the report of researches which for fairness and painstaking care deserve the greatest praise. The condition of 5,365 wage earners, in different kinds of industries, was examined. From the wage covering a five weeks' period, paid to one individual, an accurate weekly average wage was calculated, allowing for absence due to any cause.

This work was gone through for everyone of the 5,365 persons on the list. The figures thus obtained reach the nearest degree of accuracy ascertainable. The results brought out the following: Of the 5,365 workers only forty-three, or less than one per cent, receive a weekly salary of \$20.00 and upward. This means a daily pay of nearly \$3.50. Whilst we admit that \$3.50 a day is not an insignificant wage, we at the same time are convinced, that in a large family, and most of the poor Catholic families are large, this wage leaves room for no extravagant expenses, and granted that the wage does afford ordinary though limited comfort, yet it falls to the lot of less than one per cent of all workmen. What of the others?

A weekly salary of less than \$4.00 is given to 24 per cent; less than \$6.00 is paid to 56.3 per cent. Another 9 per cent is rewarded with \$6.00 or thereabouts; the salaries of another 10 per cent average up to \$10.00, or a little more. From this it is clear that some 80 per cent of our breadwinners spend their lives in long and hard work for a weekly salary ranging from two to less than six dollars.

It is not our province to make recriminations; but the conditions such as we find them force the conclusion that there must necessarily be a large, nay a very large proportion of our people who are poor.

But wants must be supplied somehow. At an age when the intellectual and moral good of the children, no less than their physical development, require that they be at school, their indigent fathers are anxious to secure work for them somewhere. Almost any position will do: it adds two or three dollars to the purse at the end of the week. This is one feature of the trouble. There is another. The case remains of those younger children, whose parents, lost to all sense of family love, shirk their duties and refuse to carry their burdens. Guardians or immediate relatives often cannot, more often will not, add to the expense which the care of their own children imposes, and therefore, the asylum is the only home to shelter and feed these little ones. From these conditions which prevail extensively in New Orleans flows a rare and vast variety of social problems of every description, moral, physical, and religious.

Endeavors to relieve suffering are not wanting. The "Protestant Board" is admirably organized. In different quarters of New Orleans, there are "centers," "halls," "missions" and such like, established for the purpose of studying the interests of the poorer classes and of applying remedies to existing evils. Officers and agents whose work is well remunerated by the Board, visit the homes of the working classes and take care of cases sent to them for settlement. It is noticeable that they manifest a peculiar willingness to bring assistance to Catholic children, if thus their attendance can be secured at "Sunday service."

Besides this Protestant Board there are City Institutions which as such are political and non-sectarian in

character. In their management Catholic influence may be said to be nil. All such institutions are under the direct authority of the Commissioner of Public Property, who governs the Board of Management, the members of which are appointed by the mayor. These gentlemen may be interested in their work; they may deserve no criticism for neglect of duty or religious discrimination, yet where Catholic rights cannot be voiced, Catholic interests are bound to suffer. Of the fifteen members of this important Board in this Catholic city, but two are Catholic. This significant fact will go far to explain why Catholic interests are neglected.

If then we ask why so many of our poor boys are lost to the Church, and why a still larger number of our young men, professing to be Catholics, do not know even the ordinary Catholic prayers, the answer is not far to seek. They were poor, means of subsistence had to be secured and were not forthcoming from Catholic sources, whilst such means were held out with open hands by Protestant organizations and by the non-sectarian city institutions. These the boys accepted and in both quarters they came under influences inimical to their Faith. By the very force of events they were set down amidst dangers and passed their younger years in companionships to which Catholic teaching was absolutely unknown. Protestantism and non-sectarianism are equally dangerous. They are both anti-Catholic; not only negatively in the sense that they cut children away from all opportunity to study and learn the obligations of their Faith, but also positively in the sense that they substitute views and ideals, natural at best, for those supernatural ideals and practices which Catholics know to be the only safeguards of the young.

Our Most Reverend Archbishop has viewed with alarm the ever increasing loss to the Church in the ranks of the poor. He has more than once manifested his solicitude for this, the most precious part of the heritage of Christ, and he has expressed the desire to deal with the problem from its material as well as its religious side. For this purpose a "Bureau of Catholic Charities" has been established. Not to speak of its primary mission and work for the orphans, the Bureau has recommended:

- (1.) That a complete census be taken of the poor families in every parish.
- (2.) That committees be formed of intelligent and earnest Catholics whose duty it will be to befriend the boys, especially those who are withdrawn from direct Catholic guidance.
- (3.) That means be devised to rehabilitate families which through sickness or adversity have fallen from their former standing.
- (4.) That an Industrial and Agricultural School be built for boys over twelve years old, the school to be under the management of some Religious Order of Priests or of Brothers.
- (5.) That a similarly conducted school be erected for delinquent boys. Ninety per cent of this class in New Orleans are Catholic and all of them are cared for in non-Catholic institutions.
- (6.) That proper representation of Catholics be obtained on

the "City Board of Public Asylums," that Catholic rights may thus be vindicated.

(7.) That a conference of Catholic charities be held to discuss all these various questions.

These plans with all their many details and adjuncts may not remove poverty, that is not their aim, but should they be put into effect, they will undoubtedly go very far towards diminishing the pitfalls and snares which have been such a powerful factor in robbing the young of their Faith.

It is evident that the good-will and resources of one man are unequal to so colossal a task. Our Archbishop needs the active cooperation of clergy and laity. The cooperation of the former should not be hard to secure. The solicitude of the pastor goes out especially to the wandering and suffering sheep of his flock, and his zeal be it ever so inconsiderable, should ensure his sympathy for any scheme that aims to save his flock.

To enlist the assistance of the laity may perhaps be a more difficult task. The condition of the poor, as we have here presented it, has not been heeded by the better class of Catholics; perhaps because its seriousness was not realized or its existence even known to them. In effect they deny that they are their weaker brother's keeper. However, judging from the generosity they have manifested in not a few other Catholic enterprises, it is reasonable to hope, that if the matter be brought home to them, they will not be unwilling to contribute their share of sympathy and service towards a work, so eminently meritorious, so eminently conducive to the glory of God, so binding on the conscience of every zealous and well-instructed Catholic. This article may arouse their interest and spur their ambition. With this hope was it written.

HENRY R. FLEUREN, S.J.

Capital Punishment: Some Objections

SOME object that capital punishment is only legalized revenge. A shoots B, and C, B's son, shoots A. That is wrong. But when the sheriff D follows A with hue and cry, seizes him, and drags him before E, F, G, etc., who constitute a court of justice that inflicts the death penalty, we have an act supremely right. Yet what are the sentiments animating the sheriff, his officers and the court? How do they differ from those that urged C to revenge?

We do not deny that the agents of public authority may yield to inordinate motives in the exercise of their functions. Nevertheless, little experience of courts and prisons is needed to convince one that such disorder is a rare exception. As a rule sheriffs, judges, jurymen, jailers, executioners are kindly disposed toward the criminal about to pay the last penalty. As officials they do their duty, but all affirm it to be most painful. Hence the difference between them and the one gratifying revenge is wide indeed. But this does not settle the question. The point at issue is whether they are performing

a real duty or an imaginary one: whether public authority is not through them practising revenge? For, after all, how many private individuals seem convinced that, in gratifying their revenge, they are performing as righteous an act as the public official who carries out the death sentence: how many others are ready to defend both the action and the opinion?

This general persuasion, culpable though it be, must lead us to suspect that private revenge is wrong only because it is the abuse of something good. No one justifies cold blooded murder. There must be something true underlying revenge on which its defense rests. Revenge is a vice. But it is related to something more commendable called vengeance, the purpose of which is to exact from offenders the reparation due to violated moral order. Hence penal justice is essentially vindictive, as we see immediately, once we have disabused our minds of the false idea that its exclusive function is to protect society and to reform the offender. The difference, then, between vindictive justice and revenge is that the former is executed by legitimate authority constituted by the Creator of human society for the restoration of order; the latter is exercised by a private individual to gratify private hate, without any authority; and therefore only heightens the violation of order produced by the original crime. And so St. Thomas says:

Should one desire that vengeance be executed according to the order of reason, the appetite of anger is praiseworthy, and is called anger through zeal. But should one desire vengeance to be executed against the order of reason, as, for example, should he desire one to be punished who has not deserved it, or to be punished more than he deserves, or not on account of the proper end, which is the preservation of justice and the correction of the fault, the appetite of anger will be vicious, and is called anger through vice. (*Secunda Secundæ*, clviii, 2.)

Another difficulty. You say that the restoration of violated order is the chief end of vindictive justice. Yet, as a matter of fact, moralists lay special stress on the protection of society and the reform of the offender, while legislators seem to consider them exclusively. Supposing the assertion to be true, the practice of moralists and legislators may either exclude positively all consideration of order, as so many penal reformers do today, or may merely omit the explicit mention of it, while, in fact, it lies at the very root of moral theory and practice. Motives are twofold, immediate and remote. The immediate motive inducing one to pay his taxes is generally the demand of the tax-gatherers and the penalties involved in postponement. But behind this must be the recognition of the right of public authority to impose taxes and the obligation of subjects to obey. A person who complies only because of the penalties consequent upon refusal, but denies the rights of authority in the matter, would not be a good citizen; for the acknowledgment of those rights, though the remote motive be hardly adverted to in particular acts, is nevertheless the habitual motive ruling efficaciously all social acts, and distinguishing good citizens from bad. Public authority, too,

though in imposing taxes it seems to consider only the raising of a certain sum of money and the efficacious means of collecting it, takes its powers in the matter for granted; and these powers suppose the moral order we have dwelt on, and the origin of authority from God, the author of human society. Similarly, in penal legislation it is not surprising that social authority should consider very particularly the protecting of society and the reform of the offender, since in these two things it finds the practical exercise of its function, namely, to preserve and protect the society, of which it is the active principle, in the observance of order. In the second place, the natural law, as found in the moral order, consists of principles of which the social application is left by the Creator to the authority He has established in human society. Gathering a general principle of penal legislation from the natural law, legislative authority applies it to such specific cases as may happen in its own social body. This application must not exceed the limits of justice: it may incline to mercy, provided this be a real virtue, not an inordinate sentiment frustrating justice. For if God has placed His justice in human hands, He has committed to them His mercy also. Hence in measuring and determining such an application, legislative authority has recourse to the practical relations of authority to society in the matter, namely, protection against aggression and the reform of the aggressor. But at the root of all lies the sense of that obligation of restoring violated order, of which the protection of society and the reform of offenders are parts; indeed, only, as such, are they matters of moral obligation and not of pure material force. To that obligation and to the natural law the legislator resorts as to the last criterion of the justice of his work. As a matter of fact, do not legislators, as well as everybody else, appeal continually to an ultimate, immutable standard of right and wrong? "This measure may be useful. It may be supported by positive law. It may have judicial decisions in its favor. But is it right?" That standard is the natural law, not only governing efficaciously human actions, but also controlling their proximate motives. Lastly, we think that, according to all experience, in establishing the death penalty, penal legislators had before their minds, not habitually, but actually, not implicitly but explicitly, not as a directive principle, but as a formal motive, though not the only one, the dictum of the natural law. Hence we said: "supposing the assertion to be true."

From what has been said, the solution of another objection is easy enough. One may argue as follows: "The end of punishment is to protect society by preventing the repetition of the crime. This is done by a penalty sufficient to deter would-be criminals and giving the means of correcting actual offenders. But you yourselves deny the justice of putting a man to death to prevent prospective murder; and once a man is executed his reformation is out of the question. Therefore capital punishment is unjust." The objection fails, because it

takes no account of the chief end of vindictive justice. Even if putting a man to death merely to prevent a future murder by himself or others is intolerable, nevertheless, given a crime which so violates moral order as to be justly punishable by death, as we have shown murder to be, the consideration of the prevention of similar crimes may and should come into the deliberations of those who have, by God's institution, to determine in what measure that penalty is to be inflicted. As for the second member, that one who is executed, cannot be reformed, it ignores the essential idea of reformation which is the return to order of him who has departed from it. This consists in a single act of the will by which one subjects himself to the order he has violated. Should the one making the act of submission survive, his reformation will be continued in a life conformable to that act. Should he die immediately after making it, he has nevertheless been reformed, unless the objector would deny the efficacy of death-bed repentance. Hence the death penalty excludes neither of the ends alleged, which indeed are but parts of the great end of punishment considered in its fulness. HENRY WOODS, S.J.

Automobilia

JONES bought an automobile today. The chances are the investment was a mistake, but time alone can tell: anyhow, at the very worst, it will be only one more mistake added to the list of a lifetime. It was not necessary for Jones to mortgage his home, or his beefsteak, or his summer vacation to pay for the new car. But he did have to stow some of his principles in the cedar closet, which is rather worse than the mortgage. He withstood the allurements of the speed-call for years, and tranquilly took his daily exercise afoot in the face of the dust flung in his nostrils from the wake of his neighbors' cars. His children were young, and with observation on the fine physical effects of walking it was not difficult to keep them subdued; he even half-persuaded Mrs Jones, that a spanking pair and a shining surrey constituted an altogether more exclusive turnout than a clumsy car with frayed-out tires and a wheezy muffler. But the youngsters grew, and they grew, and they grew; and with each inch of growth envy of their neighbors grandly whirling by while the Jones's swallowed the dust, accumulated as the square of their added flesh, and even the force of the argument from exclusiveness began to pall on the confiding helpmeet, until, foreseeing the inevitable, the die was cast, and now Jones has an automobile. Today he swept down the pike in it, and lo! it threw dust on the pedestrians who walked with him yesterday, but shall walk with him no more, as gallantly as any car that ever cast its dole upon him and his.

No man ever bought an automobile, and paid for it, and remained just the same as he was before the fateful purchase. Jones can never again be the care-free individual who jauntily stepped through his front gate for a turn down the old walk, and a chat with the gossip watchman, and a romp with his radiant-eyed collie. Henceforth he is on exhibition. His life must be an everlasting progress. He must sit up straight in his car, and after the military fashion, look neither to the right nor the left, or lean forward in the must-get-there-quick business style, or loll back against the yielding cushions in the lap-of-luxury mode. He can never be simple, happy, careless Jones again.

Yesterday as he sauntered along the country lane, he stopped

to examine the curious seed-pot of a ripening stork's bill. He drew his hand, just for the "feel," along the velvety leaf of a fine specimen of Our Lady's candle. He worried a tumble-bug with his stick just to see it play dead. He stood stock-still to gather in every note of a meadow-lark, singing from its canon's stall in the topmost branch of a pine tree. Today, in his mad flight, there are no more individual flowers for him: henceforth flowers will be only a mass of vari-colored vegetation. Tumble-bugs have passed out of his experience. He shall never hear again the full melody of a stray bird. He is in a hurry today, and will be equally so every day hereafter; and though he speeds through the woods and the fields he shall hear their intimate secrets no more forever. Even should he ride by the sea-shore, when shall he ever wait again for the breaking of the seventh wave? Jones has bought an automobile indeed! but he has lost the flowers, and the birds, and the waves.

But that is not all. No man ever bought an automobile and thought precisely the same thoughts again. Yesterday Jones was every inch a man, *homo, humus, humilitas*, of the earth earthy. He walked with his kind on his very legs. He was humble. He had a Creator. He was poor and bore his burden, and he pitied his fellow-poor and helped them bear theirs. Today he has the wings of the wind. He has become a god such as might match Jove, or make Phœbus gasp in astonishment. *Infelix Icare* indeed, with your pitiful, treacherous wings, how does Jones' new car strike you? No more humility for Jones, my good masters. If the mud from his car splashes you, it is the sort of stuff you are made of, and you should be thankful, or get a car. Jones is out for a spin. Keep off the crossing or you will get hurt. Jones does not think today as he did yesterday. Pride rules his will: he remembers not past fears.

There is still more. Last evening after a hearty dinner Jones withdrew with his interesting family to the comfort of his splendid living-room. The fumes of a cigarette exactly capped the soothing influence of the black coffee. His daughter Dorothy, a charming girl, lulled his senses with the delicious notes of Mendelssohn's "Spring Song"; little Katherine, in the window-seat, was doubled up with laughter over the parrot's welcome, "Poor Robin Crusoe, where are you? Where have you been?" Hubert, stretched out on the rug, was in a sweat over Jim Hawkin's predicament in the apple barrel; mother was filling a purple violet on the field of a fresh linen doily; a holy peace was in a Christian home. Tonight it is all different, and will be every night hereafter. Dorothy must be excused before coffee to adjust her automobile veil; Hubert must forsake his ice-cream to see that the gasoline tank is full; mother must leave the final honors to the maid as she just must be ready for a whirl at half-after-eight; all, coffee and music and literature and lazy cigarette, have flown, like love, out the window, and Jones' automobile is at the door.

There is something more. Sunday last the Jones family fulfilled the Law and the Prophets. Three of them edified the early congregation by receiving Holy Communion. The others sat without stirring through a rather florid Gloria and Credo at High Mass, and all were gathered together in the family pew at rosary and Benediction in the evening. This Sunday the pious trio could not get to Communion because they were to take a run into the country in the 1916 model, and breakfast must be had before going to Mass, as it would be inconvenient to return for it afterward. And at evening, the weather was so pleasant after the heat of the day, that all must take an hour's drive, and then at any rate attendance at evening service is not of obligation. Conscience has puncture troubles when the automobile is at the door.

On the whole, Jones paid too much for his car. The birds and the flowers, the music and story, the incense and the house of prayer will never again be the same for him. "Macbeth shall sleep no more."

M. J. RORDAN.

The Sources of Modern Achievement

THE cave man exhibiting not only good taste but really fine artistic ability in the ornamentation of his weapons and in the decoration of his primitive home, as well as in his manifest desire to have everything near him not only useful but beautiful, is a violent contradiction of many modern ideas regarding evolution and progress in humanity. Attention should be called to the fact that untaught primitive men have at all times in the world's history exhibited some of the highest traits of humanity. Not education, but native genius counts in human achievement. Over and over again the son of the peasant, without any of the artificial helps of human education, has formulated clear ideas that have deeply influenced the human race and have proved enduring in their effectiveness. The greatest painter of the nineteenth century was not some pampered pupil of the schools with all the advantages of art education consequent upon intimate contact with many masters and a world of art spread out before him, but the peasant Millet, neglected to the point of starvation by his own, selfish sophisticated generation.

It is well known that the example of Millet, far from being exceptional, is rather typical. A genius develops where least expected, the wind of the spirit of originality blows literally where it will. Oriental rugs, Indian blankets, primitive pottery, even the strong, rugged colonial but effective furniture, and in recent years the imitations of the furnishings of peasant homes in various parts of Europe, represent the basic ideas for interior decoration to which we are paying so much attention. Progress is actually made by getting away from the fixed ideas of the people who believe that what they possessed and loved represented the very last word in art development, though in point of fact these fashionable art modes really represented degeneration rather than advance. The old Greek story was that when Antæus touched the ground he drew renewed strength from mother earth. From history it is clear that art always runs to seed unless it is verified by the infusion of the coarser but vigorous strain that so often comes from the common people. Giotto, like Millet, was a peasant boy, and his story is constantly repeated in the history of art.

In an article from a late *Craftsman*, on "More Color in the Home," unsigned and therefore presumably by the editor himself, the opening paragraph is as follows:

It is a curious and significant fact that many interesting modern developments in art, craftwork, architecture, cabinet-making and other fields, owe their inspiration to the most primitive of sources. "Out of the mouths of babes" may be applied not only to the wisdom of philosophy but to the truth of art. Strange as it may seem for a civilization so complex as ours to turn back to a simple and "uncultured" people for guidance or inspiration, nevertheless some of our most beautiful handiwork today is based upon peasant art. And this, not so much because of a fad or passing desire for simplicity, but rather because we are discovering that behind such products lie certain fundamental principles of strength and beauty.

The facts set down in the above quotation are a repetition of what happened among the cave men, let us say at least 7,000 years ago. The peasant of the modern time is the cave man of the older time, and both of these, uninfluenced by any sophistication, untrammelled by unfortunate educational tendencies, and unhampered by the knowledge of what others have done, achieved good art, just out of the taste that was born in them. Without any consciousness of it, they do things that the sophisticated world of culture wakes up to recognize as better than anything that is being done now, in spite of the advantages that are supposed to be

derived from accumulated knowledge. The writer in the *Craftsman* goes on to tell why this is so:

The peasant craftsman first of all makes his work sturdy, durable, fit for the wear and tear of daily usage. He makes it pleasing in proportion, partly from his understanding of the lines of strength, partly from an innate feeling for harmony. And above all he sees to it that his product has the attraction of *color*. For, unlike us, the idea of color does not frighten him. No Puritan ancestors have instilled into his soul the suspicion that orange and purple are "loud" or "undignified," or that scarlet is the symbol of sin. Even the centuries of social suppression and constant toil have not killed his esthetic sense or his love of nature, or curbed his eagerness to echo, in however crude a fashion, the vivid tones of her leaves and blossoms upon the hand-made furniture and utensils that form the fittings of his cottage home. Indeed, may it not be that this desire for color is the outcome of those very conditions of poverty or unremitting labor in workshop, field or farm? And may not this use of pure pigment be a source of such consolation and enjoyment that it brings light and sunshine into even the dulllest cabin, and invests the round of labor with the dignity of art? But whatever the motive, we must admit that color, in most of the art of Europe's peasantry, is handled in a remarkably effective and masterly way. And when we study this original work we can hardly wonder that it has afforded inspiration for radical departures in furniture-making and interior decoration.

Perhaps it may be thought that the peasants who accomplished such work have had all the advantages of modern education and have become skilled by instruction. There might even be the feeling that just as the shepherdesses of poetic Arcadias or of Watteau's pictures lacked the nature of real shepherdesses, so these folk were peasants only in name. There is no reason, however, to think of them as anything but simple country people, unspoiled by book knowledge, unhurt by contact with what is called civilization, and happily able, therefore, to express themselves in beautiful, strong, homely art. Mr. Alfred A. Hesel, of the Crafts and Art Studio, speaking of his experience among the Black Forest peasants, said:

It is interesting to see how naturally their art comes to these people. Even when we called in farm hands to help with the making and decorating of this furniture, they seemed to experience no difficulty; without previous training in cabinet work, they handled their tools, put the wood together, and painted the finished pieces, and they used their colors with that instinctive sense of beauty and harmony which all these villagers and farmers seem to possess.

Apparently one of the universal ideas of our time is that everything must be taught to men. With this impression, of course, it is felt that as men go on and are taught more and more they are better able to do things than ever before. The more we get away from theories of education and get at the realities of history, the more it is brought home to us that what is best in men, their good taste in art and literature, and their conscience, is a free gift. We cannot always tell why we like things, nor why we feel that we ought, or ought not to do them, but we have the strong conviction within us of the correctness of these ideas. Men at all times and in all places have had these feelings and convictions. The old cave men and the peasants of our time represent two phases of primitive man, with good taste and artistic ability, not because of any mythical place in evolution, but because of their God-given natures as men. This truth has been lost sight of in a good deal of the superficial talk about evolution and progress in recent years. It is time to leave the theories and study the facts. My dear old teacher Virchow used to say that we had wasted some fifty years of biology in Europe trying to bolster up a theory of evolution, when as yet we knew nothing about it, instead of studying the facts and drawing the conclusions demanded by them.

JAMES J. WALSH, M.D., LL.D.

COMMUNICATIONS

Letters, as a rule, should be limited to six hundred words

Mr. Moore and Transubstantiation

To the Editor of AMERICA:

Mr. Moore's last letter is a most remarkable document. Imagine it, Article XXVIII condemns certain unofficial teaching of certain pre-Tridentine Roman theologians about Transubstantiation! Wonderful! The Anglican Church is officially breaking off relations with the Roman Church, is officially setting up its own code of doctrine as part of the opposition to Rome and yet the Anglican Church, engaged in this momentous work at this momentous time, simply denies an unofficial doctrine of some obscure theologians! That's history for you, and an argument too! And then, would you believe it? Mr. Moore declares "Article XXVIII cannot be said to condemn a dogmatic teaching of the Catholic Church, for it explicitly states that what it does condemn 'overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament,' and the official Tridentine definition does not do this." Great goodness! Has white become black and black, white? Why Mr. Moore, Trent or no Trent, the article says explicitly that it condemns Transubstantiation because *Transubstantiation overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament*. Here are the words of the article. Read them please. "Transubstantiation (or the change of the substance of Bread and Wine) in the Supper of the Lord, cannot be proved by Holy Writ; but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, *overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament*, etc."

Listen to Mr. Moore's probable answer: "Oh yes, but don't you see that our divines meant something different from your Catholic Transubstantiation?" No, Mr. Moore, I don't; unfortunately for you the divines single out "our Catholic Transubstantiation," define it as Catholics do and then damn it as defined by Catholics, *because it overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament*. More than that all Anglican theologians did so and do so now, those few excepted who, since Tractarian days, have been trying to wash the face of the Anglican Church. Bishop Browne, for instance, explicitly rejects Transubstantiation and declares the doctrine of the English Church the same as Calvin's. Continuing, he declares: It [the doctrine of the Anglican Church] teaches that the *bread and wine are received naturally*; but the Body and Blood of Christ are received *spiritually*. And Jeremy Taylor the great, great Anglican declares: "The result of which doctrine [the Anglican] is this: it is *bread*, and it is *Christ's Body*. It is *bread in substance*, Christ in the Sacrament." I know that Mr. Moore will reply: "All right, they are not infallible." Is Mr. Moore? They were Anglican theologians, Anglican bishops; accepted teachers of the Anglican Church, skilled interpreters of the mind of the Anglican Church, as far as it has any.

Though Mr. Moore is strong on "begging the question," his difficulty lies just here; he begs the question of the Catholicism and Catholicity of the Anglican Church and then to satisfy a prepossession, tries to fit heresy into the mold of orthodoxy. This explains the following facts: I quote Bishop Browne who denies that the Anglican Church accepts Extreme Unction as a Sacrament in any sense or form. Mr. Moore retorts: he's not infallible. I quote Cranmer who with Ridley maintained a doctrine nearly identical with Calvin. Mr. Moore replies that Cranmer agreed with St. Thomas, or better perhaps, that St. Thomas agreed with Cranmer. I quote the blasphemous oath in which the *Supreme Head of the Anglican Church* denounced Transubstantiation for some centuries. Mr. Moore tossed the Head aside. I quote the Westminster Confession against Mr. Moore, and he flouts the Confession. I quote the Homilies against Mr. Moore, and he replies, that they "are purely his-

torical" and contain only "a godly and wholesome doctrine, and necessary for these times," forgetting that the *history therein contained* rejected five Sacraments and that the *godly and wholesome doctrine* was *heresy*. I quote Article XXV literally, to the effect that five Sacraments are "not to be counted for Sacraments of the Gospel, being such as have *grown partly of corrupt following of the Apostles, partly are states allowed in Scripture*, and Mr. Moore replies that the article does not say that the five are not Sacraments, but merely that they are not "Sacraments of the Gospel, etc.," omitting the significant words of the Article which follow. In other words Mr. Moore is a thoroughly good Protestant; he, not Anglican formularies, nor Anglican doctors, etc., may tell him what Anglicanism is; he'll exercise his right of private judgment and believe just what suits him. This I know, is his privilege, for Dr. Hodges declares: "Nobody may speak for the Episcopal Church. One of its characteristics is its hospitable inclusion of *very different people*." Of course Dr. Hodges is not infallible, but then neither is Mr. Moore; the result is a city of confusion.

A last word: Mr. Moore made many assertions, which I wish to set down with answers thereto as follows: (1) The articles are not held by Anglicans to be literally accurate statements of dogma. Ans. For three hundred years the Anglican Church accepted them as accurate statements of dogma and used them as the basis of lectures on theology, in her schools and universities; (2) The original purpose of the articles was primarily negative, to condemn errors prevalent at the time. Ans. Heresy is contained in negations also; the articles are largely positive in nature and assert errors; (3) No Anglican authority of any consequence nowadays holds them to be of permanent value or entirely binding in the details of faith. Ans. (a) This is not to the point; (b) Competent Anglican authorities do hold them to be of permanent value; (c) The permanency of their value is neither here nor there. Acceptance for *one instant* by the church suffices for my argument; (d) Details are not in question; but the essential signification: this is heretical; (4) One of our theologians points out that the articles condemn thirty-one Protestant doctrines and but four practices and *not one doctrine* of the Church of Rome. Ans. The articles condemn *many* Catholic doctrines. For instance, Article VI sets up a false rule of faith; Article IX a false doctrine on concupiscence; Article XII a false doctrine on good works; Article XV denies the Immaculate Conception; Article XXI sets up a false doctrine on the Sacraments; Article XXVIII a false doctrine on the Eucharist; Article XXXI sets up a false doctrine on the propitiatory value of the Mass, and ends with these horrible words: "Wherefore the sacrifices of Masses, in which it was commonly said, that the priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits." These by way of example.

New York.

GEORGE RUSK.

[The controversy between Mr. Rusk and Mr. Moore is closed.
—Editor of AMERICA.]

Woman Suffrage

To the Editor of AMERICA:

If Jane Campbell would use right reason in testing the cures proposed for those ills which many innocent persons believe woman suffrage to be the means of correcting, it is certain that, to her, the "high-sounding phrases," of which she complains, would not be "obscure." A thorough understanding of the subject sends the thought high above and far below superficial discussion. There are two modes of estimating the worth of the modern proposals for social justice: first, to assimilate Catholic Philosophy, which has been well called an anti-toxin, and by its means to reason out

the errors and the heresies proclaimed; second, to acquire that delicate but sure sense which estimates at its just worth any specific sociological proposal or propaganda. The first method, that of right reason, the anti-toxin with its "three years of philosophy and its four years of theology" may be expected from few. But the second means is open to every woman who has access to the Communion rail, where her whole being is illuminated, that she may know right from wrong and win the courage to maintain the right against all comers. The very fact that the real issue of woman suffrage lies deep down beneath commonplace research shows how skilfully his Satanic majesty has planned his vast campaign for the destruction of the rights and the dignities which the Church has vindicated for women. And the pity of it is that many well-meaning women, though harking back to the ideals echoing in their souls and to those real days when Christian faith cultivated chivalry in the hearts of men, go not on to Rome for relief but to rebellion.

Although my critic may imagine that "women are merely asking a voice in the government of themselves," in reality she is asking that democracy, by aiming at the destruction of the original form of government, that is, the family, shall run its race to madness and to death. The blending of the principles of pure aristocracy and of pure democracy in the Church throws much light on the several forms of civil government; but study of the Church gives no comfort to those who would blot out aristocratic government in favor of democratic government, or to those who would blot out democracy in favor of aristocracy. For myself, I love my country, for which the blood of my sires was spilt. If women were merely a class, there would be logic in the accusation that they only who repudiate democracy are opposed to votes for women. But it should be borne in mind that several rather large classes of men, and this in order to safeguard our democracy, are excluded from the polls. Poor democracy! this suffrage burden is not hers, it belongs to anarchy. For although there are classes of women, woman is not a class, but a sex. Morally equal to man, though unlike man, she is the female person of the two-fold human element that goes to make up the family, by which, according to the basic designs of Almighty God, the race is to maintain itself. It is this living union as manifested within the sphere of politics that suffragists would break down, but "they know not what they do." Their captain, however, who seeks whom he may devour, knows full well what they are about.

So it is that my objections to woman suffrage, when "sifted down," are not objections to "suffrage in itself," not objections to complete and equal suffrage for men, but rather objections founded upon the basic facts of the human constitution itself, to which, evidently, the thought of my critic has not as yet penetrated. Permit me to acknowledge my acquaintance with those "suffrage leaflets" which are recommended to cure my ignorance, and to say that innocent ignorance on the one hand, and vile trash on the other, with erratic argument as the "golden mean," make the sum total of the message which the cause sends forth. Please allow me to add, that my trips to the "Western States" have but more firmly fixed my conviction that some of my countrywomen have what they are ill qualified to use and what in their heart of hearts they do not want. Of course the vote given to women in the Mormon States, and in adjacent States, is an irrefutable argument that where the integrity of the monogamic family is least protected there woman suffrage most flourishes. Moreover the "democracy" advocated by the Reverend Lady Doctor, the recently retired president of their national organization, is sure proof that it is a *plank in rebellion's platform*. Miss Shaw declares, "If I

were a czar I would unmarry half the people I know." Can one fancy applause for such a statement from Catholic women? The very form of my critic's phrases point clearly to radical emotions and sentiments. Manifestly the time cannot be said to have "passed," for there never was such a time, when "woman's work was entirely in the home." There was, there is, and ever must be work for women within organized society, economic, civil, social and religious, in addition to her work within the home. But it is an error to assume that the home is evolving into a cooperative kitchen and a barracks bed-room.

Certainly "we do not condemn Christianity because some of its professors have held erroneous opinions. Nor do we condemn suffrage precisely because of the socialistic 'entanglements of certain Feminists.'" But we do condemn both suffrage and Socialism because they are one in their effort to secure a deformity, a double-headed family. Happily the errors of individuals are not incorporated into the body of Catholic doctrine, but this is true only because it is preserved in its integrity from the intellectual vanities and inanities of mankind by the assistance of the Holy Ghost. As a matter of fact, however, all Socialists are suffragists, and all suffragists, if logical, should be Socialists, since both demand the disruption of the unit of civil society, the family, in favor of the individual. Lacking logic and that delicate sense of right and wrong, that is given with the Blessed Sacrament, a person may be "amazingly ignorant," and small wonder that it should be so, of the real character of the doctrine which he propagates with a zeal worthy of a great cause. As I had neither one nor the other in the days when Transcendentalism with its over-soul was the best god I knew, I must now do penance for the harm I may perhaps have done in propagating a Socialism all my own.

How naive! All voting looks alike! The stockholder's vote, the vote in clubs, the vote in charity organizations are cited in proof that "voting is not a question of sex." Bless their hearts! how funny this all would be if their propaganda were not in truth a very real menace both to Christians and to the State.

MARTHA MOORE AVERY.

Mr. Moore and Papal Supremacy

To the Editor of AMERICA:

Father Fisher very properly asks for "the names of some of the greatest of the Fathers who denied" the Roman interpretation of Matt. xvi: 18. In reply I must first frankly confess that the form of my statement was unwittingly exaggerated. I should rather have said that some of the greatest of the Fathers have given other interpretations than the later Roman one, and that we Anglicans thus feel ourselves *not* condemnable for holding the Papal interpretation to be justly open to grave doubt. Three quotations will suffice to indicate the grounds for my assertion. (1) St. Hilary of Poitiers, in his work *De Trinitate* (Bk. VI, sects. 36 and 37), speaking of St. Peter's confession, "Thou art the Son of God," says, "This is the rock of confession whereon the Church is built." "This faith it is which is the foundation of the Church; and through this faith, the gates of hell shall not prevail against her." (2) St. Chrysostom in like manner writes (Homily 54, on Matt. xvi: 18 ff): "'And I say unto thee that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church,' that is, upon the rock of his confession." (3) Even St. Gregory the Great who can hardly be accused of anti-papal bias, affirms (Commentary on Psalm CI) that "the Son of God is the Rock from which Peter derived his name, and on which," i. e., the Son of God, "He said that He would build His Church."

Finally, as to the main point of Father Fisher's reply to my letter, certainly his article was written for Catholics, but when

in that article a reference is made to an earlier letter of the undersigned, and we are told that Anglo-Catholics pick and choose between the sayings of Christ which they like and those which they do not like, I cannot but feel that it is time to object. We do not, Thomas-like, reject your interpretation of the "Thou art Peter" because we "were not present when Christ said" those momentous words, but because we do not feel that what He said is at all equivalent to what you would have the world believe He said. Nor do we take this position on the Protestant ground of individual or sectarian judgment, but on the Catholic ground of *quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus*. Only if we assume beforehand that Rome is the whole Church, has the Roman interpretation of the disputed proposition any conclusive authority.

Cleveland.

JARED S. MOORE.

Social Work for Women

To the Editor of AMERICA:

Is it not sad, lamentably sad, that many Catholic ladies waste so much valuable time in clamoring for woman suffrage? True, the system of voting that exists at present is unscientific and unethical. It is not, however, an extension of individual suffrage that we need, but rather the introduction of organic suffrage.

I do not intend to enter upon this question now. I simply wish to call the attention of your readers to a more useful line of female activity. There is, for instance, the social question, which can be solved only by justice and charity; and the sphere of charity belongs preeminently to women. Then there is the mission question, home and foreign. While I was studying in Rome I often visited the institution of Countess Ledóchowski, where missionaries from Africa, Asia, etc., give lectures occasionally during their stay in the Eternal City. The missionary work done by this noble woman is of greater and more permanent benefit to humanity than all the campaigning and electioneering of the suffragists. Why cannot we, in the United States, have our diocesan organizations of women like those founded in Italy, Holland and other countries of Europe? What an immense amount of charitable and missionary work could be done by such a national organization.

West Depere, Wis.

D. G. R.

Well Directed Charity

To the Editor of AMERICA:

Last year a friend of mine happened to be passing through a particularly poor section of the city a day or so before Christmas. He himself had a good share of the pleasant things of life, and for that reason was moved to make a little contribution to the Christmas cheer of some poor family. Thinking that his charity might be most wisely distributed if he applied to the Catholic priest of the particularly squalid section in which he found himself, he called at the rectory, and intimated his desire that a large bank note might be given to some deserving family or families. The person whom he consulted was an ecclesiastic, who gave the incredible advice to keep his money, as the people in that section of the city would be sure to squander it on drink. Angered at the reply, he gave the sum to the Salvation Army, and had the consolation of knowing that his mite found its way into the hands of the poor, if not into the hands of Catholics. This year other instances of similar, not ill-advised but certainly less well-directed charity, have come to my notice, and have betrayed an ignorance of the workings of the St. Vincent de Paul Society, that is lamentable. Why do not our Catholics put the money they intend to give to the poor directly into the hands of the St. Vincent de Paul Society? Here is an organized medium of charity that offers the greatest possibilities of good, and is safeguarded from deception.

New York.

JAMES TURNER.

A M E R I C A

A · CATHOLIC · REVIEW · OF · THE · WEEK

JANUARY 1, 1916

Entered as second-class matter, April 15th, 1900, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3d, 1879.

Published weekly by the America Press, New York.
President, RICHARD H. TIERNEY; Secretary, JOSEPH HUSSLEIN;
Treasurer, JOHN D. WHEELER.

SUBSCRIPTIONS, POSTPAID:
United States, 10 cents a copy; yearly, \$3.00
Canada, \$3.50 Europe, \$4.00 (16s.)

Address:
THE AMERICA PRESS, 59 East 83d Street, New York City, N. Y., U. S. A.
CABLE ADDRESS: CATHREVIEW

Stamps should be sent for the return of rejected manuscripts.

No Room

NO, there was no room. They might go anywhere they pleased, but here they could not stay. And the inn-keeper turned his back upon them and went about his business. They dragged themselves along the roadway, out of the little village and up the hillside, where they found a cave. There, when all things were in silence and the night was in the midst of her course, the Maiden Mother brought forth her first-born Son and laid Him in a manger, because there was no room in the inn.

No room then, no room now. How like the refusal of that first Christmas Night is the refusal of the Park Commissioners to find a place for Romanelli's statue of Christ in San Francisco! They find that it is "a religious subject." Therefore, there is no room for it.

Yet none who walk in Golden Gate Park can fail to notice on an eminence, Drake with his Prayer Book Cross. No objection was made to its erection either by historians, though what it commemorates is at best dubious, by Jews, though it is a Christian Cross, or by Catholics, though it is a memorial of the Church of England. Nor, though it is a religious symbol, was objection moved by the Park Commissioners.

But for Christ's statue, there is no room. It is "a religious subject." Certainly. But are religious subjects to be made taboo in San Francisco? It may lead to intolerance, some fear. In the present instance, the Commissioners need not have feared this accusation. The Constitution of the United States guarantees immunity from compulsion in religious worship: a thousand statues would leave that privilege untouched. He must indeed be a fanatic who claims that the erection of a statue to Christ in a public park can in any sense interfere with the absolutely free exercise of a man's religion.

By no just title was the statue rejected. It was the

work of artistic genius, commemorating the greatest among the sons of men. Jesus Christ was the wisest teacher the world has ever listened to, the greatest philanthropist who has ever worked for the betterment of the race, the mightiest organizer of all times. There has been no purer, sweeter, holier, kinder man than Jesus Christ, none more brave, none more heroic, none more disinterested. He is the highest expression of all that is good in human kind, the essential exclusion of all that is wicked. For all this His statue might have been accepted. The earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof; and yet in the city of the Golden Gate there is no plot of ground on which to set His statue.

The whole unhappy incident is but a sign of the times, the echo of the cry of the inn-keeper. "There is no room." No room in our homes, no room in our lives, no room in our city. Christ, now as always, stands in many a man's way; for to him that believes not, He is a stone of stumbling and a rock of scandal. San Francisco has no room for a monument to Christ. Then block the sun and dull the stars, shut out warmth and music and light, and silence the murmuring of the sea, while the universe resolves itself into its primal nothingness. Away with them, for all are but a monument to Christ. Scatter your forces over all the earth, and whatever of learning or science or culture or art you may find, blot it all out; for it is a monument of Christ. Let woman sink back to her pagan level, for her purity and her sanctity is a monument of Christ. Build up the mart for slaves, value human life as of yore; for freedom is a monument of Christ. Let the poor live in oppression, and the sinner be hounded, and the sick languish without care; for justice and mercy and love, are a monument of Christ.

San Francisco has not room for Romanelli's statue of Christ? Will it be found acceptable elsewhere?

Poverty and Character

THE editor of a certain prosperous magazine who offers his readers excellent advice on the advantages of economy aroused, by so doing, the wrath of a woman who has to maintain a family on \$800 a year. "Has it ever occurred to you," she asked, "born with the proverbial silver spoon in your mouth, that theoretical writing is pretty cold and futile compared to the actual hand-to-mouth struggle that so many of us live, day by day and year in and year out—an experience that you know not of?"

Apparently that was just the kind of letter the editor wanted, for it gave him the opportunity to show from his own life's story why he believes in poverty, and the article he wrote has lately been published in book form. He came to this country, we are told, at the age of six without knowing a word of English, and his parents were so destitute that he and his brother had to go hunting at night for pieces of coal. At ten he got his first

job, and some years later "became a reporter during the evenings, an office boy daytimes, and learned stenography at midnight," thus succeeding in supporting a family of three on \$6.25 a week. He writes:

There is not a single step, not an inch, on the road of direst poverty that I do not know or have not experienced. And having experienced every thought, every feeling, and every hardship that come to those who travel that road, I say today that I rejoice with every boy who is going through the same experiences. . . . I know the value of money as I could have learned it or known it in no other way. . . . I used every rung in the ladder as a rung to the one above. It meant effort, of course, untiring, ceaseless and unsparing, and it meant work, hard as nails. But out of the effort and the work came the experience, the upbuilding, the development, the capacity to understand and sympathize: the greatest heritage that can come to a boy.

The foregoing testimony to the value of poverty, "always as a condition to work out of, not to stay in," will doubtless be corroborated by many a man and woman among our readers who realize that they would hardly be the steadfast characters they are today, if stern poverty had not attended their earlier years. The spineless, unambitious, luxury-loving representatives of the "third generation" that are being so severely criticized nowadays, cannot be held wholly to blame because those epithets describe them so well. For a large share of the responsibility falls upon their over-indulgent parents who forgot too readily the value of work, privations and self-denial as molders of character.

The Empty Grotto

FOR centuries, even before the Crusades, it had been the consolation of innumerable Christians, Orthodox and Catholic, to journey during Christmastide to the Holy Land. By thousands men have traveled far over land and sea to attend the Masses of the Nativity and Epiphany, close to the star that marks the place where Christ was born. Others who could not go in person to the church built by St. Helena, have gone in spirit; and as these latter knelt before the cheerless limestone grotto, which in imitation of what the gentle Francis of Assisi used to do, the Church has reproduced in all her Christmas chapels, they have thought of the straw and the manger, the shepherds and the Wise Men, Joseph and Mary and the Divine Child in Bethlehem of long ago. Mystic pilgrims these, cherishing in their hearts a holy envy of those who were pilgrims in very deed. This year there were only pilgrims in spirit. This Christmas there were no Christians to celebrate the Birth of Christ on the hillside where David tended his sheep. The Turk had bidden them begone. The sanctuaries, blest beyond all others, were unattended; the light that hitherto had led the way to the spot that marks the beginning of man's salvation had been extinguished; unbelievers held the holy place; and if angel choirs sang again their welcome to the Infant Saviour,

they were not heard by those who believe that God for our sake became a little child. Here is another of the wrongs to humanity that must be laid at the door of this cruel war. It has robbed Christians of their ancient Christmas privilege of keeping holy Christ's Birthday in the cave where to gain our souls He became like unto us in all save sin.

The Annual Bacchanalia

IN the last days of Advent, the saloon keepers of a great eastern city flooded the mayor with tearful humble petitions. Their desire was simple. They prayed permission to celebrate the coming of New Year by keeping their saloons open all night. The mayor denied their plea, and ordered them to close their shops at 3 a. m. Patrons, however, were allowed a reasonable time in which to take their departure.

In this there is nothing intrinsically wrong. Practically, however, it is all wrong. Every one knows what "a wide open night on the Gay White Way" means. So do the saloon keepers. However, for the benefit of the unsophisticated, it may be stated that the practical intent of the saloon keepers' petition is to request public sanction for the consecration of the New Year to Bacchus and maybe to Venus.

Essentially ours is a government by laws, not by men. Yet when municipalities deem it expedient to invest certain powers in their chief executives, it is the duty of all good citizens to see that these powers are used for the public welfare, and not for the promotion of public scandal.

Hypnotism for Inebriates

AN emeritus professor of Columbia University has been advocating the use of hypnotism for the cure of alcoholism. Dynamic suggestion, he maintained, can impart to an inebriate, while in a state of hypnosis, a sufficient amount of "pluck, pull, push, and self-reliance to keep the sufferer away from alcohol or tobacco the rest of his life." All this is to be accomplished by an appeal "to his subconscious mind, his subliminal self, his superior spiritual personality." Fine words these, which give an air of apparent finality to a subject that is still after long study, almost entirely in the experimental stage and is to a large extent a matter of interesting speculation only. The professor's efforts to give hypnotism a permanent importance are not surprising; such efforts are a thing of periodic recurrence, and though hitherto unsuccessful, yet they make a warning to the unwary advisable.

The curative possibilities of hypnotism have never been accorded a permanent, honored place in scientific medicine; nor has hypnotism itself ever succeeded in getting from the profession, as a whole, more than a frowning tolerance. Even when employed by expert

physicians, its value for healing has never been accounted high; in the hands of the unskilful it has had deleterious effects of so serious a kind that in many places stringent legislation prohibits or restricts its use. At best, the good effects it has produced have been largely discounted by the nervous derangement consequent on the disturbance of brain centers, which it is generally believed is the preliminary condition of its exercise. Moreover, the consensus of reputable opinion holds its beneficial results to be transitory.

Its remedial effects in the case of drunkenness seem to be neither more nor less than those of other cures for intemperance. A passing disinclination to imbibe spirituous liquors may be engendered, and under this influence the victim may find it easier, owing to a subconscious sense of restraint, to abstain for a time. During this truce with his hitherto almost over-mastering passion, the inebriate may gain strength for further abstention from alcohol. If this were all that the professor claimed, his words might be accorded a provisional credence; but when he goes further and says that hypnotism can produce life-long cures we hesitate to accept his statement at his own valuation. Either the cure would be effected by a dangerous post-hypnotic influence persisting for years; or else the cure would be effected by the infusion into the patient of "pluck, pull, push and self-reliance." It is certain, however, that these qualities cannot be "infused," for bitter experience makes it clear that they are engendered and developed only by the conscious exercise of personal effort.

While not pronouncing hypnotism therefore in itself and under all circumstances illicit, we would sound a warning against its use. Its advantages, even when it is employed with all the precautions recommended by the Church, are very dubious, while its perils are very clear. It would be imprudent to deny, in the face of apparently well-authenticated reports, that hypnotism has had a certain measure of remedial success in the case of intemperance; Catholics, however, would do well both to abstain from the use of hypnotism until it has passed out of the experimental stage, and to remember that the sovereign cure for intemperance lies in the avoidance of dangerous occasions and in the development of will power by personal effort, fostered and strengthened by the Divine grace which comes through prayer and the Sacraments. Hypnotism is by no means the panacea enthusiasts would have us believe.

Our Re-Resolutions

REGARDING the identity of the first person to take a New Year's resolution, history is silent. Perhaps it was Father Adam, for at the threshold of his post-paradisaic career he must have been in a rather resolution-making mood. In the early Middle Ages, when the twenty-fifth of March, the Feast of Our Lady's Annunciation, was New Year's Day and the festival was

emphatically religious in its character, it was doubtless easier than it is today to take and even to keep heroic resolutions. The blithe and merry springtime, too, when hopes are high and the earth is fair, seems a more propitious season for beginning all over again than is our dour and chilling winter. In this country, and particularly in our large cities, the increasingly pagan character of the revels which usher in the New Year is making the practice of sobriety and self-control on the part of whole classes of our population less common on January 1, than on any other day of the year. The resolutions that were seriously framed December 31 are seldom in active operation January 1, for New Year's, of course, "doesn't count." Indeed, so weak is the flesh and so feeble the will of these worshipers of Janus that the clients of his who have some details of their projected reformation of life in good working order by Twelfth Night can be considered fairly steadfast characters.

The practice of taking New Year's resolutions, whether they be many or few, is entirely praiseworthy. Those who draw up an elaborate schedule of reforms, however, must not expect to carry them all out successfully. In the spring the apple trees bear innumerable blossoms, but in autumn the yield of fruit can be easily reckoned. Had the blossoms been few, however, the fruit would have been nil. But wiser, no doubt, is the man who makes no new resolutions at all each year, but merely dusts off and furbishes up the old. Indeed, he generally discovers that the noble purposes he conceived at the beginning of former Januaries are still as good as new, for they have been little used. One practical New Year's resolutionist of this kind instead of determining to keep a diary at least till February 2, to give up the use of tobacco altogether, to rise at 5.30 a. m., and to walk home from his office every day, merely resolved to be kind, busy and devout. Being, moreover, as was explained, a practical resolutionist, he even fixed upon certain persons—and some of them belonged to his own family—to whom he was to be kind, formulated detailed plans for the profitable use of his leisure hours, and actually mastered a working knowledge of just what being "devout" means.

Easy Writing

AT the close of the nineteenth century, a new spirit had enveloped the earth. Men's minds were in a ferment; the inevitable reaction had set in. Scholars who had affirmed conclusions with dogmatic insistence now advanced their cautious theses with a reserve which argued fundamental doubt. The spell once exercised by the vitality of a symbol upon whole nations had been forever dissipated," and so on.

The amount of earnestness contained in the preceding lines is in inverse ratio to the number of words employed. Men's minds may have been in a ferment at

the end of the nineteenth century, or they may have been as clear as crystal—a large term; a new spirit may have enveloped the earth at that time, or swamped it, or asphyxiated it, or displaced it in the solar system: all that has lost interest for us. But the paragraph has an interest as an example of “easy writing”; the kind that is merely the task of slipping paper into a machine and working the keys. In other words, it is frothy, quite unreal, altogether out of joint with facts. This is the usual style of the author, Dr. Lyman Abbot, whenever he discourses about dogmatic religion. His rather solemn prepossessions are mistaken for facts of the objective order, and his fancies are written down with an air of finality that would do credit to a youthful doctor devoid of a sense of humor, or an ecumenical council in full session.

In a recent article, the Doctor has fairly surpassed his best efforts in the art of “easy writing.” “In the seventeenth century,” he tells us, “to be religious was to retire from the world.” It was not. The Doctor could have learned as much by consulting any penny catechism of the period. “To be religious,” he continues, “was to leave one’s home, one’s industry, the common life, and retire to a monastery, and there practise the exercises of religion, fasting, prayer, meditation.” Nothing could be farther from the truth. In Catholic teaching and practice, then as always, to be religious meant to love God above all things, and next, one’s neighbor for the sake of God. People can do this in the world as in a cloister; have done it, and must do it, for only the chosen few are called to the cloister. St. Isidore was a farmer, Blessed Thomas More, a lawyer, St. Maurice a soldier, St. Margaret a queen, and St. Monica, the busy mother of a family. St. Louis of France was truly religious in a camp and in a palace, Blessed Joan of Arc in a hut as well as at the head of an army. Not one of these men and women ever lived in a cloister, or withdrew from the world; but because all of them exemplified the Catholic ideal of a religious life, the Catholic Church by canonizing them, has held them up as models. And a model, in the plain language of common sense and of ascetical writers, ancient and modern, is something to be imitated.

Butler’s “Lives” is a fairly accessible book; Dr. Abbott will do well to consult it before he again dogmatizes on the Catholic ideal of a religious life. The man who can write with all gravity that “St. Francis Xavier was as truly a product of the Protestant Reformation as Luther or Wesley,” stands in great need of some such elementary guide. “I can give a better lecture on Spain than Mr. Stoddard,” a youthful lecturer once remarked, “because I have never been there, and hence am not bound by the facts in the case.” In writing of the Catholic Church, Dr. Abbott has always fretted at the facts in the case. Why indeed should he trouble to go to Spain, when “easy writing” seems to satisfy his readers?

LITERATURE

How to Collect a Library

“AS all well-conducted weekly journals,” writes an observant correspondent, “are accustomed to publish every year an informing article on how to collect a library, I trust that AMERICA will not fail to offer its readers a paper on that subject before the end of 1916.” Gratefully accepting the admonition, the present writer determined with canny forehandedness to be, if possible, the first in the field this year, and to get the desired article into the issue of January 1.

Though it is universally conceded that from a pecuniary point of view the least expensive way of gathering together a library is the common one of systematically borrowing the books of friends, the older moralists regard this method with stern disapproval. They tenaciously hold that “to borrow” means obtaining a thing from another with the expressed or implied promise of returning it within a certain period. Those who borrow books, therefore, should bring them back while the owners are still living. Modern theologians, however, maintain that that rigorous doctrine was sound enough, no doubt, in the Middle Ages when books and manuscripts were rare and precious, for an illuminated Psalter could easily be worth a king’s ransom and a text of Vergil would be almost priceless, but nowadays, say they, when books are so numerous, cheap and common, the moral obligation of returning a volume rests only secondarily on the borrower, for the one chiefly responsible for the book is the lender, because of his consummate folly, human nature being what it is, in allowing the work to leave his possession. Some moralists of today even hold that the lender becomes accessory to the borrower’s sin, if sin there be, by deliberately exposing him to the temptation of covetousness. They maintain, moreover, that as the borrower *tenetur rem commodatam diligenter custodire*, “is bound to guard carefully the thing borrowed,” he may without sin, when the object in question is a book, guard it even from the lender and that too for 999 years, though Robberti, it should be said, favors the opinion that after the decease of both borrower and lender the latter’s heirs may lawfully claim the book. It is an interesting coincidence too, we might observe in passing, that regarding borrowed umbrellas, the teaching of modern moralists is precisely similar to the foregoing doctrine about borrowed books.

Guided by the learning of these moralists, many a diligent book-borrower of our day is laying the foundation of a noble library, though it must be admitted that as the number of his volumes grows greater, the number of his friends grows less. But after all can anything worth while be had in this world without sacrifices?

To those afflicted with a New England conscience, however, this conventional way of acquiring a library presents a difficulty. But such men, particularly if they have made within a few years a large fortune, are inclined to regard shelves of books merely as furniture. “So much wall-space,” they calculate, “must be filled with books,” and for that purpose there is, of course, nothing better than *éditions de luxe*, “world’s classics” and works no-gentleman’s-library-should-be-without, all bound sumptuously in uniform morocco. These are the men, moreover, that the Machiavellian book-agent and the altruistic promoter of “special editions” consider their natural prey. Behind the polished glass of Mr. Bullion’s bookcases can be seen glittering sets, still uncut, not only of Scott, Dickens, Thackeray, Eliot and Hawthorne, but also of the “Bessarabian Bards,” the “Orators of Argentina,” the “Novelists of Iceland,” the “Historians of Nineveh” and the “Philosophers of Crete.” “Five-foot bookshelves” of various makes also abound, but the set to which he will point with the greatest pride is likely to be the “Modern Realists’ Complete Works” with each of the one-hundred octavo

volumes autographed by the author, appropriately illustrated by Foul, magnificently bound in russia and brought out in what is fortunately a "very limited edition." For the modest sum of \$5,000 Mr. Bullion secured set No. 9,423 of this invaluable work, but happily he will never open any of the volumes, but will be content to glow with satisfaction as he beholds what a rich and imposing appearance they give his bookshelves.

But what counsel shall be offered those who are eager to gather together a library which will be a library indeed, of which every volume is an expression of the literary taste and intellectual preferences of the collector? Men and women too honest to "borrow" books and too poor and too wise to buy "complete sets," can build up an excellent little library by confining its contents to the books that they have actually read and enjoyed. Let the collector be thoroughly sincere with himself in this respect. No volume should find a place on his shelf just because it is a "classic" which nobody reads, or a "best seller" that "everybody reads." Books which he really found an intolerable bore, the intellectual snob will pretend he has read with inarticulate rapture, just because he has heard that it is the "correct thing" to be enthusiastic about such and such a writer. Better far is it to confess honestly: "I find 'As You Like It,' dull, 'Hamlet' prosy, 'David Copperfield' tiresome, 'Silas Marner' inartistic and 'In Memoriam' meaningless," than to accept at second-hand and without true conviction the stock critical estimates of these works. Nevertheless our sincere library-maker should pray unceasingly for the gift of really enjoying the books which the world's best judges have declared to be good.

A little library composed exclusively of the volumes the collector has read with pleasure is his intellectual photograph. But certain bashful book-lovers are averse to letting the chance caller see this mental likeness of theirs and various devices are employed to foil curiosity. Turning the books' backs toward the wall is a cruel but effective rebuke to the inquisitive, and veiling the true portrait of the collector's mind by placing a second row of self-revealing books behind a non-committal first row. The successful library-maker will learn to be very exacting too in his choice of authors and will sternly refuse a place on his domestic bookshelf to blasphemers, profligates, wantons and charlatans. He certainly would not admit such persons into his family. Why should he welcome them to his selected library?

A slowly accumulated store of 300, 500, 700 or 1,000 books, every one a favorite, every one with a little history connected with its acquisition, every one a volume that the owner has read and reread with profit and pleasure: that is a real library. Each volume in it should come from a reputable publishing house that has the right to bring it out, and every volume should be clearly printed and serviceably bound. But eagerness to bring the books of a library into rigid uniformity of size and binding, that Muscovite proclivity which is sometimes the passion of old-maidish collectors, is quite as sensible and practical as requiring a similar uniformity in our friends and acquaintances would be. But the library of which there is question here is a choice collection of real books, of volumes which contain, perfectly expressed, the noblest thoughts of the world's master-minds.

WALTER DWIGHT, S.J.

REVIEWS

La Psychologie de la Conversion. Par TH. MAINAGE des Frères Prêcheurs. Paris: Gabriel Beauchesne.

This keenly analytical and fascinating work is a sequel to the "Introduction à la Psychologie des Convertis" of the scholarly Dominican. Father Mainage brings his readers face to face with an interesting problem, which he then studies in all its bearings: "How is it that men either indifferent

or positively hostile to Catholicism become the fervent and loving followers of a religion which they either ignored or openly opposed." To solve a problem which has puzzled and baffled so many, the author examines the various psychological causes, which from a human point of view might be thought capable of explaining it. These causes he finds to be: the rational inquiry of the mind after truth or the mind's constant endeavor to find reasons for its belief, the effort of the will, the affections of the heart, the social surroundings and influences, the workings and manifestations of those "subconscious" phenomena so cleverly expounded by William James, and, finally, certain morbid states or conditions of the soul. But not one of these factors singly, not all of them together, can explain the phenomenon and the miracle of conversion. In two excellent chapters, "The Invisible Educator" and "God in the Souls of the Converts," the writer affirms and proves the existence and reality of an external action and influence on the intellect and will of the convert, which, while leaving him perfect liberty and autonomy, yet moves him to the appointed end. This is the Grace of Christ, the invisible educator and molder of the soul.

The mere outline of this comparatively short but masterful volume shows how simple and solid, how illuminating and timely it is. Father Mainage is thoroughly acquainted with the psychological theories and what we might call the "convert literature" of the day. Copious examples and illustrations and the use of modern instances, such as the "Oxford Movement," the conversion of Mgr. R. H. Benson, Albert von Ruville, Hermann Cohen, Jørgensen, Father Hecker, the Caldey Monks, etc., make the book attractive and "up to date." The work is sound in doctrine and principles, everywhere marked by rich and varied scholarship. It is a real contribution to modern apologetics. For priests and directors engaged in the difficult task of leading others in the search of truth it will prove a safe and helpful guide.

J. C. R.

Belgian Poems. Chants Patriotiques et Autres Poemes. Par ÉMILE CAMMAERTS. English Translation by TITA BRAND CAMMAERTS. New York: John Lane Co. \$1.50.

Belgium's Agony. From the French of ÉMILE VERHAEREN. By M. T. H. SADLER. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin Co. \$1.25.

The judiciously made selections from the poems of Émile Cammaerts, a poet but little known to American readers, but one nevertheless of nature's genuine songsters, appear both in the original French and in a free rhythmical but unrhymed English translation by the wife of the gifted author. This Belgian singer, in spite of a rugged diction and the homely nature of his themes, has literary gifts of a high order. The poems, whether written before the war or during the great crisis, breathe simplicity, tenderness, pathos, reverence for holy things and for that Faith to which Belgium owes so much of its glory. They have the true poet's authentic blazon and seal, the one gift which can make us often forget even serious defects: inspiration and soul. Like Riley, the "Hoosier poet," he loves the woodlands and the fields, the song of the birds, farmland and farm folk. By their martial swing and music, his "Chants Patriotiques" remind the reader of the drum-beat accents of Déroulède.

A dozen chapters of fiery denunciation and fierce, passionate hate make up the substance of Verhaeren's unwholesome volume, for he preaches the gospel of hate. Verhaeren was not the man to write of "Belgium's Agony." He lacks the poise, the calm, the judicial temperament. Among clear thinkers and impartial readers the book will perhaps do harm to the cause he is pleading. But in the eyes of Catholics the Belgian writer is guilty of a still more serious offense, for while a Catholic King and Catholic soldiers are

fighting in the trenches and on the firing line for Belgium, and are finding in their Catholic faith the one thing that has not failed them in their hour of sorrow, Émile Verhaeren wantonly outrages and insults their religion and belief. The true friends of Belgium will regret the appearance of this book.

J. C. R.

The Greatest of Literary Problems: the Authorship of the Shakespeare Works. An Exposition of All Points at Issue, from Their Inception to the Present Moment. By JAMES PHINNEY BAXTER. New York: Houghton, Mifflin Company. \$5.00.

Once more the Shakespeare-Bacon controversy is brought to our notice. Mr. Baxter's exhaustive volume is not a mere compilation, but the result of a vast amount of original research, yet it likewise reproduces or describes for us the documents and materials gathered by preceding controversialists and the various theories elaborated by them. This lends a value to the book aside from the controversy itself, in so far as it supplies many interesting Shakespearean data. Shakespeare as seen by the author, in the light of the documents he quotes, was nothing but a rude, unpolished villager in his early days, later a useful drudge in the stables and theater of the Burbages, and a man available for minor parts and in arranging the stage for their plays. He was a coarse and dissolute boon-companion, and on his retirement to Stratford a close-fisted, shrewd, unscrupulous and avaricious dabbler in petty loan transactions. Whatever may be thought of the writer's own argument, he seeks fairly to meet all the leading objections against the Baconian authorship from Ben Jonson and many other sources. Bacon's character is presented as an exalted contrast to that of the Stratford actor. Again much use is made of original documentary evidence, and some of this evidence is very interesting and cleverly interpreted. He agrees with Dr. Owen in attributing to Bacon not only the Shakespeare works, but likewise plays attributed to Green, Peele and Marlow as well as the "Faerie Queen." Bacon, he says, sought to avoid similarity of style in these different productions but could not disguise his hand, as he tells us in the "Shakespearean" Sonnet 76:

Why write I still as one, ever the same,
And keep invention in a noted weed
That every word doth almost tell my name,
Showing their birth, and where they did proceed?

Among the many reasons for secrecy ascribed to Bacon is the argument adduced by the author, himself a Mason, that Bacon was a member of the secret order of the Rosicrucians, and wished thus to exercise his influence over the men of his generation. Some passages occur in this volume that are not intended for youthful readers.

J. H.

Schools of Tomorrow. By JOHN DEWEY and EVELYN DEWEY. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co. \$1.50.

The School and Society. By JOHN DEWEY. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. \$1.00.

It is to the credit of the American school authorities that they welcome criticism. Mr. Taft is but one of many who have recently expressed in public their dissatisfaction with the finished product of the modern school. What these critics have said in the open, hundreds of teachers have said in their hearts these many years. Something is rotten in the state of public education; just what the source of the corruption is, no one seems able to say with finality. But if criticism is of any value, this source will soon be discovered, and, if we are courageous enough, removed. For many of its undoubted shortcomings, the school cannot be held fully responsible. Social and economic conditions have changed as vastly as the very physical outlines of our rapidly-grow-

ing cities during the past quarter-century; the school has endeavored to adjust itself to these changed conditions, but not with complete success. The period has therefore been one of stress and strain, and what is worse, in response to new and inconsiderable demands, the school has too often lost sight of old and valuable principles of education.

In his first volume, Dr. Dewey has endeavored to describe, objectively, certain newer movements current in primary and secondary education. He has not compiled a text-book on education, he assures us, "nor yet an exposition of the new methods of school teaching." His purpose is "to show what actually happens" when these hitherto untried forces are cribbed, cabined and confined within the walls of an actual school. As a statement of facts observed at Gary and elsewhere, the book will be of much value to the student; not so the author's discussion of these facts. The second volume is a revised reprint of lectures delivered at Columbia fifteen years ago. The most valuable chapter is that devoted to Froebel's educational principles. Teachers will find much that is stimulating in these pages; but it should be noted that Dr. Dewey seems to have studied what he terms the "older psychology" at the feet of a charlatan. As a presentation of scholastic psychology, it is a caricature.

P. L. B.

The New International Encyclopædia. Second Edition. Vols. XIII-XVI. New York: Dodd, Mead & Co.

These four volumes of the "New International" include the terms between Jovanovic and New Forest. Many titles catch the eye as one turns the attractively illustrated pages: the sketches of the Leo's, for instance, concluding with a sympathetic account of Leo XIII, that great nineteenth-century Pontiff. Then there is the Mass by Father T. J. Campbell, S.J.; Modernism by Rev. Dr. Patrick A. Halpin and Monasticism by Dr. James J. Walsh. The recent death of Booker T. Washington makes the article on Negro Education of timely interest, but it is disappointing to find in it no mention whatever of the widespread work of the Church and Catholics for the intellectual and moral advancement of the colored race in the United States. In the view of the two compilers of this article nothing seems to have happened before the Civil War, or before the era of Hampton and Tuskegee. Their bibliography on the subject is incomplete without a mention of Dr. Carter Godwin Woodson's "The Education of the Negro Prior to 1861," in the very first pages of which he declares: "The Spanish and French missionaries, the first to face this problem, set an example which influenced the education of the Negroes throughout America," and thereafter in his book he continues to pay tribute to the Church's insistence on the conjunction of religion and letters. Dr. Woodson's treatise is the very latest (January, 1915) and most exhaustive treatment of the subject. If this Harvard professor could find so much to say in this direction, surely the Encyclopedia's contributors neglected to investigate their subject fully, and have failed to do justice to a very important detail of its development, as well as one of the most significant social problems of the country.

T. F. M.

BOOKS AND AUTHORS

Kate Sanborn, the author of "Memories and Anecdotes" (Putnam, \$1.75), must have made hosts of friends in the course of the busy career of which she here gives us glimpses. To these friends the volume with its sixteen excellent illustrations will doubtless furnish entertainment, but other readers are not likely to find the volume particularly interesting. Her brief account of a day spent at the Concord School of Philosophy during its opening season is more amusing than the first President of New Hampshire's daugh-

ters in Massachusetts probably intended, and in the latter part of the same chapter there are several poems that are worthy of praise.

The carefully compiled volume of "Critical Essays of the Eighteenth Century, 1700-1725," (Yale University Press, \$1.75) which Willard Higley Durham, Ph.D., has edited and provided with an introduction and with notes will be of great value to literary students of the "Age of Anne." Charles Gildon, John Hughes, John Dennis, George Farquhar, Richard Steele, Joseph Addison, Alexander Pope, Leonard Welsted and Allan Ramsay are the critics represented. Dennis's "Reflections upon a Late Rhapsody called an Essay upon Criticism" is a particularly amusing example of old-fashioned savageness in reviewing. This book is apparently intended to be the first of a series of volumes on eighteenth century criticism.

The action of "The Secret Bequest" (The Ave Maria Press, \$1.25) is very rapid. Honora Trezevant leaves her office a fifteen-dollar-a-week stenographer, stops a few moments, though no Catholic, in the quiet church of the Paulist Fathers at Fifty-ninth Street, thence to a strap in one of New York's proverbially over-crowded "L" trains and there meets the lawyer Maxwell, even then bound for her tiny apartment to inform her that she is heiress to a fortune. Here most authors would be content to tell us, "they lived happily ever after." But this heroine-quest was not the happiness of money alone, but the achieving of her uncle's secret bequest. How this was brought about gives us Christian Reid's latest and perhaps most interesting novel.—Richard Pryce has followed up his success in "Christopher," by a new novel, "David Penstephen" (Houghton, \$1.35). For plot-development and balance, for delicacy of expression and the creation of an atmosphere about place and person, the book deserves commendation. But the author's moral sense does not equal his artistic. For David's father and mother, who is pictured as the sweetest of womankind, are too freely excused for their open rebellion against the laws of religion, and convention. David, however, is noble from the first to the last chapter. When, as a young man, he finds out, rather dramatically, the solution to the mysteries which had puzzled his earlier years, he is rather ennobled than crushed by the mortifying discovery. The reader will close the book with a question as to David's success in the path of life to which all his inclinations have been leading him.

Is it the ancient Protestant tradition regarding the-hours-I-spent-with-thee-dear-heart kind of Sister that suggested the following graceful verses on "An Enclosed Nun," contributed to the January *Century* by Sarah N. Cleghorn?

Along the pleasant streets of Sliding River
Upon a limpid April afternoon,
Sometimes I meet an absent, smiling lady
With hair turned gray a little while too soon.

A little while too soon she donned a bonnet
Before her blush and dimple went their ways;
She masked her youth in staid and sober colors,
And hid it with calash and polonaise.

Now as she paces toward the Lenten lecture,
The Shakespeare Circle, or the Dorcas Band,
She seems to look beyond the home horizon
Forgetful of the work-bag in her hand.

Sunk in what lost love, spellbound with what dreaming;
Linked to what by-gones, not in time to part,
She builds about her an aerial convent,
Vowed to the Order of the Brooding Heart.

Though the professed nuns of the Order here described may abound in the world, they are exceedingly rare in the cloister.

An out-and-out Niobite simply cannot live within convent walls.

A paper in a personal, reminiscent vein, contributed by Katharine Tynan to the December *Studies* entertainingly describes the progress of poesy in the United Kingdom during the past thirty years. She testifies that in the 'nineties a poet "rather scored by being a Catholic," but ten years later, "to be a Catholic was to be banned." Coming down to today, she refuses to admit that the present war, as is commonly asserted, "has produced no fine poetry." "I have read many poems on the war; I have not read one entirely unworthy, and nearly all I have seen attain a high level of poetic expression." The writer names as particularly worthy of praise:

The poems of "Æ" in the *London Times*; Kipling's "For All We Have and Are"; the three poems of Laurence Binyon, "To the Women," "The Healers," "For the Fallen"; the two poems of Gilbert Chesterton, "An Old Wife of Flanders," and "Blessed are the Peacemakers"; H. De Vere Stacpole's "Alsace"; the "England" sonnets of Rupert Brooke.

She then calls attention to "the revelation of poetry among the soldiers themselves," making special mention of Robert Nichols' "Invocation," and "Into Battle," by Julian Grenfell, who was slain last summer, and in whom "the spirit of Sir Philip Sydney lived again."

The conviction is not at all uncommon among Catholics that the term of a religious novitiate is a period spent in seclusion with no return at all commensurate with the time employed; to many non-Catholics the word "novitiate" conveys the idea merely of a vague but mysterious place or time or person, and how often, too, have we heard a postulant or novice called a "novitiate"? The brochure of Brother Chrysostom, "The Pedagogical Value of the Virtue of Faith as Developed in the Religious Novitiate" (McVey, \$1.00), setting forth, as it does, the educational value of the time of the novitiate, will dispel both misconceptions. The little work is only the first part of the dissertation submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for his Doctor's degree.—Under the title of "Meditations on the Passion of Our Lord," the Right Reverend Joseph Oswald Smith, O.S.B., (Benziger, \$0.70) has prepared fifty-four instructive and readable discourses on the Sacred Passion. Though the volume is a small one, its contents cover the entire period of Our Lord's last hours from Gethsemane to the Holy Sepulcher, and as a fitting appendix the sorrows of Our Blessed Lady are described. The author's successful purpose has been to emphasize the practical lessons contained for the Christian soul in every line of the Passion. The book is as useful for spiritual reading as for meditation.

"Spindriff" (Putnam, \$1.00), a prose anthology, edited by Geoffrey Callender, begins with Wyclif and ends with Froude, and is intended "to show how the masters of English prose have been affected by the sea." A good deal of curious sea-lore is found in these pages, as well as a footnote which gives the proper pronunciation of "Hakluyt."—"More Jonathan Papers" (Houghton, \$1.25), by Elisabeth Woodbridge, is a series of sketches of out-door life, the real charm of which lies in the delicate and happy descriptions of nature's beauties. The stories of experiences in the open and on an old farm are enlivened by the whimsical dialogue of a couple who enjoy with equal zest the pleasures of garden and stream. Though, manlike, Jonathan has the less to say in the pages of his lady's book, still her love of the rural life is so pleasingly portrayed, that the reader is glad that Jonathan's prose did not crowd out her poetic fancies.

EDUCATION

Mooted Points in the Gary Plan

MY vague recollection of an Arabian Nights tale is that the patient but hungry Shacabac struck the Barmecide a box across the ears, not only because the feast was imaginary, but because, in addition, he was asked to assent to his host's ecstatic praise of the non-existent viands. I am not inclined to draw an analogy between this deplorable conduct and the present hot disagreement in educational circles, over the merits and possible applications of the Gary System. Analogies are dangerous; but I may be permitted to state my belief that the critical opposition offered by both teachers and laymen, to certain zealous advocates of the Plan is based on the fact, that the two incomplete demonstrations in the city of New York furnish a very inadequate basis for the extravagant claims which have been made.

THREE LINES OF CRITICISM

The Barmecidian character of the dispute becomes more marked when refuge is taken in the assertions that the two Garyized schools in New York are but mere frameworks of the Plan; that they have been hindered in their operation by difficulties almost insuperable; that New York school buildings "are unintelligently built and miserably equipped"; and that the virtues of the Plan, embodied in the Emerson and Froebel schools in the satellite city of Chicago have been strangely overlooked by New York's Committee on School Inquiry.

At the risk of repetition, I propose to refer to three lines of criticism for which satisfactory answers should be obtained, before the school authorities of New York or of any other city with similar school problems, lend their support to the Gary Plan. The Plan, while a real contribution to duplicate school organization, has yet to demonstrate its stability, economy and effectiveness, when subjected to the exaction of conditions as they exist in New York. It is surely legitimate, then, to state the reasons alleged for and against the economic features of the Plan; to emphasize the novel but doubtful pedagogical features of its program; and to suggest as a measure of the validity of the Plan, an examination of the extent and method of its adoption in certain other communities.

ECONOMY

No sane person will hold that economy is out of place in school management. If, however, economy means placing the dollar above the needs of the children, educators who fail to enter a vigorous protest are recreant to their duty. It is important, then, to examine closely the economies which are said to be possible under the Gary Plan. These are:

(1.) Two schools may be housed in one building. This saves part of the cost of an additional site and building, and results in a decrease in the cost of maintenance.

(2.) The duplicate school organization may be administered on the basis of the "Model 72 Class Program," which requires but one principal, and permits a reduction in the teaching staff. This reduction is made possible by distributing class units as monitors, as pupil-teachers, or as assistants in the shops and laboratories, and by sending classes, for part of the school program, to various neighborhood agencies.

(3.) The school equipment may be maintained in proper repair by the joint labor of the shop teacher and pupil assistants.

(4.) Such agents as truant officers and home visitors may be dropped, and the work of investigating truancy, and unsatisfactory conditions affecting the pupils' welfare, can be assigned to the teachers.

DISCUSSION

It is aside from my purpose to argue the converse of these propositions at any length, but I will suggest the following facts:

(1.) Superintendent Spaulding of Minneapolis found that the per capita cost of schooling in Gary, despite the low teaching wage, was thirty-eight per cent higher than in his own system.

(2.) In a report made by Mr. Wirt on July 30, 1914, at a time when he was free from the importunities of a Board of Estimate, panic-stricken by the prospect of an increased tax-rate, *two principals* were recommended for every duplicate school, and an official teacher for every class, whether the class was on the playground or in the auditorium. He further stated "that cities can finance adequate work, study and play programs, *only* when *all* the facilities of the community for the work, study and play of the child are properly coordinated with the school." The scheme to contract school facilities by vacating old buildings and introducing duplicate schools in organizations already too large, suggested, according to this report, that due consideration be given Professor McMurry's recommendation: "The present tendency to increase the size of schools should be checked, and a desirable size should be agreed upon for the future, possibly not exceeding approximately thirty teachers." Finally, Mr. Wirt admitted, that since the independent social agencies represented by the libraries, churches and settlement houses were not as yet coordinated with the school, all classes programed for out-of-school periods must necessarily be accommodated by the school itself, even though an increase in cost is thus involved.

(3.) In Public School No. 45, the Bronx, no serious attempt has been made to apply the maintenance scheme so as to provide prevocational training, and at the same time keep the school in proper condition.

(4.) The substitution of the teacher for the trained social worker, either truant officer or home visitor, is in keeping with other suggestions whose value has never been proved.

NEW EDUCATIONAL FEATURES

In the next place, while the Gary Plan recommends numerous novel educational features, it is a fact worthy of note, that schoolmen have never been able to agree upon their value. The proposed innovations to which most serious objection has been raised are the following:

(1.) The departmental plan of teaching for all grades.

(2.) The assignment of pupils for extended daily periods as assistants in the halls, auditoriums and classrooms.

(3.) The promiscuous grouping of younger and older children for work in the auditorium, laboratories and shops.

(4.) The paternalistic scheme of extending the school day of pupils from 8:15 a. m. to 4:15 p. m., as in a program submitted in New York, and of forcing pupils of the so-called "Y School" to do intensive mental work late in the forenoon and late in the afternoon.

(5.) The use of outside activities in the home, church, studios of private teachers, social centers and libraries, as the equivalent of regular school courses.

(6.) The substitution of casual, unorganized shop instruction, based on the maintenance theory, for the organized sequential instruction given in the typical prevocational and vocational school.

RESULTS IN OTHER CITIES

If in judging the value of the Gary Plan, we disregard the adverse criticisms advanced on certain features by five New York superintendents, and by the Superintendents in Elizabeth, N. J., Syracuse and Minneapolis, not to speak of resolutions passed by associations of parents, teachers and principals, and turn to the localities in which the Plan has either been adopted in whole or in part, or quietly experimented with, a number of interesting facts are brought to light which do not bear out the claims of its advocates. In not one of these communities, is either the extent or the mode of adoption, such as to warrant a belief that the Gary Plan is in anything but an experimental stage. Sewickly

has a school population of but 800, all housed in one building; New Castle has a limited application of the Plan in four buildings; Winnetka, Troy and Los Angeles have adopted the plan in one school. Kansas City follows the Plan in two of her seventy-two schools, but after a trial of two years is unwilling to give any judgment as to its value. Philadelphia, Chicago and Cleveland have not adopted nor do they contemplate adopting, Mr. Wirt's theories; and this fact is the more significant, since the educational problem in these cities is comparable, both in magnitude and complexity, with that of New York.

AN UNPROVED THEORY

Whether, then, the Gary Plan be regarded either from the standpoint of economy, or of the novel pedagogical features that seem to be integral to it, or in the light of its adoption by various communities, the inevitable conclusion is, that it is as yet only an experiment, neither superior, nor even equivalent, to the best program of the orthodox type. A touch of idealism, or a spirit of generous enthusiasm, frequently makes appreciation march far in advance of actual achievement. To revert to the Arabian Nights, it may be that the Gary Plan is the "open sesame" to educational treasures; but until we have subjected the sparkling jewels and the rich brocades to the searching light of criticism, it is simple wisdom not to cast aside our present habiliments, threadbare and tattered though some claim them to be.

WILLIAM E. GRADY,

Principal, Public School, No. 64, Manhattan.

SOCIOLOGY

Brothers in the Dust

"**T**IRED and tiresome reader," permit me to remark, altering a plume from O. Henry, "I shall proceed, if you please, to elucidate the present situation by a few lessons written by him of Gad's Hill, before whom, if you doff not your hat, you shall stand with a covered pumpkin, aye, sir, a pumpkin." And by these words many amongst us, particularly of the modern school of sociologists, are convicted of putting that golden treasure of New England to the base usage of a personal headpiece; an adaptation which, like Friar Bacon's marvel, delivers unconnected, but not cryptic, utterances.

DICKENS, A TEXT-BOOK

I have never heard of a school of sociology which uses as a text-book a neat compendium of the social views of Dickens. Perhaps this anthology has never been arranged. It would be worth a thousand volumes written by What's-his-name and What-d'ye-call-him, in the spirit of Mr. Filer, who could prove you by tables that Toby Veck's humble dinner wrested tripe from the mouths of widows and orphans over all England. Such a compilation is needed, but I fear it would not be welcomed, just as Dickens is no longer welcomed by those "literary people" who have teas and drums and five o'clocks, and think that Zola's English is exquisite, whatever may be said of his morals.

For almost daily does a low-grade immigrant literature, mostly from the north of Europe, consigned to our smug illiterati and unstopped by any sieve-like Ellis Island, drop with the customary dull and heavy thud upon our unoffending shores. With this tribe, Dickens is not precisely popular. He is too clean, too intelligent, too charitable, and too cheerful. Worst of all, the man actually believes in the Providence of God. As if this were not enough to damn him, he is "inartistic." He lacks the finer intimate touches, the haunting reticences, the shadowy nuances of Van Schoonacker, one of whose dramas recently caused even a

broad-minded New York Inspector to shake his head with a shy air of reproach. Like George's landlady, confronted with a thirty-pound Stilton, he thought he detected a faint odor of onions, deleterious to public morals.

THE CREW OF WALPURGIS

Modern sociology likewise has its Van Schoonacker, but not even a lenient New York Inspector to suppress him for the public weal. Following the lead of the cocksure biologist, who almost proves his contention by his existence, he considers man as differing only in degree and not in kind from Fido gnawing a bone under the table or Tabby murderously playing with a mouse. He calls evil good, and good evil, and with the possible exception of mayhem and witchcraft, there are few crimes which have not been advocated as social remedies by some crack-brained sociologist. A comparison of the main currents of modern sociological wisdom with that ancient but still interesting code, the Ten Commandments, will convict these assertions of understatement.

With this Walpurgis-Night crew Dickens would have no part. He believed that there is a place in the world for even a crippled child; if for no other reason, to stir up the kinder feelings of the human heart. "Spirit of Tiny Tim, thy childish essence was from God." His big heart would gladly have set boiling alive in oil as the penalty of child-murder or child-mutilation, or, if he were found in a fiercer mood, condemnation to listen to the lectures of a modern school of sociology for a term of years. "Are there no work-houses, jails, poor-houses?" asks Scrooge, when requested to contribute, a scandalous example, by the way, of encouraging mendicancy, to a Christmas dinner for the poor. "If they would rather die, they had better do it, and decrease the surplus population."

DICKENS ON "SURPLUS POPULATION"

With much less directness, modern sociologists repeat Scrooge's suggestion. But they have not the human eyes that can see "a vacant seat in a poor chimney corner, and a crutch without an owner, carefully preserved." Nor have they ever been lectured to their profit by a Ghost.

Man, said the Ghost, if man you be in heart, not adamant, forbear that wicked cant until you have discovered What the surplus is and Where it is. Will you decide what men shall live, what men shall die? It may be that, in the sight of Heaven, you are more worthless and less fit to live than millions like this poor man's child. O God! to hear the Insect on the leaf pronouncing on the too much life among his hungry brothers in the dust.

Scrooge's conversion was a mistake. Every one of the propositions condemned by the Ghost is a commonplace of modern sociology; consequently, Dickens as a sociologist is absurd. In one short paragraph, he calls on the name of God, thinks it well to designate by some standard other than poverty or physical defect what part of the population is "surplus," discountenancing murder in any case; and he avers that, in giving life, an omniscient God may have a wise purpose hidden from the miser or even the sociologist.

ON POVERTY

Dickens hated the oppression that is often the immediate cause of poverty, and I think he would have delighted, with his own hands, to stretch those modern masters who pay girl workers four dollars and fifty cents weekly, upon the rack, and then to build a fire beneath them. But he never made the mistake of being unable to see any profit in poverty. True, poverty is not in itself a positive good. It does not follow, however, that it is an absolute evil. The acceptance of the teachings of Jesus Christ would end such poverty

as is the result of sin, but not, necessarily, all poverty; and, in any case, the acceptance of the Divine teaching makes poverty a positive means of true success. Of itself, even from the natural standpoint, poverty has no greater power to destroy happiness than riches have to give it. Man is not the toy of circumstances; in a truer sense than Henley meant, he is the master of his soul. Bob Cratchit had but "fifteen of his namesake a week," and the family display of glass was two tumblers and a custard cup without a handle; but he had a fairly happy life, especially at Christmas time, and so did his family.

They were not a handsome family; they were not well dressed; their shoes were far from being water-proof; their clothes were scanty; and Peter might have known, and very likely did, the inside of a pawnbroker's. But they were happy, grateful, pleased with one another, and contented with the time.

This is shocking. Bob committed a social crime in daring to marry, probably upon less than "fifteen bob" a week, and Tiny Tim should either have been sent to a State institution, or better, have been chloroformed in infancy.

A MEDIEVAL SOCIOLOGIST

That Dickens did not agree with these views on marriage, or on the murder of defectives, is but further proof that his ignorance of scientific sociology was "medieval," like the *Atlantic Monthly's* ignorance of the debates at the Council of Mâcon. But he understood a truth hidden from the wise of our generation; that want is not synonymous with misery.

The Spirit stood beside sick-beds and they were cheerful; by struggling men and they were patient in their greater hope; by poverty and it was rich. In alms-house, hospital, and jail, in misery's every refuge . . . he left his blessing.

Like all who trust in God more than in worldly advantages, Dickens did not believe that marriage should be solely conditioned by financial considerations. He was the matchmaker in a number of delightfully imprudent marriages, and he innocently believed that the consequent sacrifice and hardship were good both for the individuals and for society.

POVERTY AND MARRIAGE

Alderman Cute, for instance, and his familiar, Mr. Filer, lived before the days of modern sociology; but no small prophetic insight into its practices was granted them. Alderman Cute's method of dealing with poverty was to Put it Down; Mr. Filer was an expert in statistics. "Married! Married!" he cries out, when Richard announces his intention of uniting his poverty with Meg's.

The ignorance of the first principles of political economy on the part of these people; their improvidence; their wickedness; is, by Heavens! enough to—Now look at that couple, will you! . . . A man . . . may labor all his life for the benefit of such people as these; and may heap up facts on figures, facts on figures, facts on figures, mountains high and dry; and he can no more hope to persuade 'em that they have no right or business to be married than he can hope to persuade 'em that they have no earthly right or business to be born. And *that* we know they haven't. We reduced it to a mathematical certainty long ago.

These lines read like a paragraph plagiarized from the Report of a Society for the Improvement of the Condition of the Poor by prying into their private affairs. But what Meg and Richard thought about it, and what all of us who are yet Christian believe, Dickens expresses in Meg's plea to her father.

And how hard, father, to grow old and die, and think we might have cheered and helped each other! How hard in all our lives to love each other; and to grieve, apart, to see each

other working, changing, growing old and grey. Even if I got the better of it, and forgot him (which I never could), oh, father dear, how hard to have a heart so full as mine is now, and live to have it slowly drained out every drop, without the recollection of one happy moment of a woman's life, to stay behind and comfort me, and make me better.

After this we are all glad to know that Toby didn't fall from the steeple, but lived to enjoy many another dish of smoking tripe without defrauding the orphans and widows of England; that the homeless stranger met a welcome in the motherly bosom of Mrs. Chickenstalker; and that, despite the sociologists, Meg and Richard were married and lived happy ever afterward, seasoning, according to the Wise Man, their dinner of herbs with love.

SCIENCE AND HUMANITY

We can always be sure that the demands of justice will not suffer when Dickens is on the bench. If he gives poor Smike but little happiness here below, he leaves him with the light of a heaven, destined for those whose hearts are as the hearts of little children, shining in his eyes. He never forgets that man is something more than an animal; he knows that some day the balance of justice disturbed by man's inhumanity to man will be restored, and without striving to reconstruct the world with God left out, he is courageously content to trust in the Divine Providence.

As a scientific sociologist, therefore, Dickens has a smaller brain-capacity than the redoubtable Mr. Toots. But Toots could be a knight, which was to his credit, as well as a fool, which was not his fault. "There may have been brighter intellects in this world," says Dickens, "but few kinder and better hearts." I quote from memory; but the description fits Dickens himself. On both counts is it inapplicable to the modern godless exploiters of our "hungry" brothers in the dust."

PAUL L. BLAKELY, S.J.

NOTE AND COMMENT

The latest issue of *Rome* contains some interesting facts about the decrease in the number of priests in certain parts of Italy. This table sums up conclusions in this most tangible way:

	Year 1759	Year 1915
Population of Piacenza.....	30,590	40,391
Priests (secular and religious in city).....	1,303	119
Population of Fiorenzuola.....	4,000	7,656
Priests (secular and religious in city).....	120	9
Population of latter Diocese.....	169,835	263,543
Priests (secular and religious in Diocese).....	1,485	467

Such figures should calm the troubled souls of those who lament the fact that Italy is the "most priest-ridden country in the world."

A local confirmation of the saying that in the midst of life we are in death is furnished by a recent *Bulletin* of the New York Department of Health, according to which a death occurs in the city of New York about every seven minutes. As a counterbalance, a birth is registered about every three and one-half minutes. The exact figures for September, 1915, are: deaths, 5,543; births, 11,606. The greatest single cause of death was tuberculosis. During September, 735 persons, about 24 daily, were carried off by this disease, and an average of fifty-nine new cases were reported daily. "Organic heart trouble" is responsible for twenty-three deaths a day; bronchitis, pneumonia, and other respiratory diseases for sixteen; and cancer stands fourth in the list with a daily average of twelve deaths. In the same month, there was a suicide every day, with twenty-two homicides in the Borough of Manhattan, but the total for the city was sixty-four suicides and thirty-five homicides. Three hundred and sixty-three persons, about twelve a day, died "vio-

lent deaths" during September. The great prevalence of tuberculosis, a disease against which preventive measures may be readily employed, suggests the advisability of a more active interest on the part of the public, in the educational campaign of the anti-tuberculosis societies.

An inspection of the sermon-synopsis published in many New York, Philadelphia, and Chicago newspapers, answers the question why the Protestant churches are losing their hold on the masses. Most of the clergymen who appeared in print, discussed the President's message, "preparedness," athletics, the European war, literature, the latest "problem play," and local politics. Few men will form a habit of listening to these essays and orations, because of the simple fact that they can find a more satisfactory exposition of the news of the day in the daily press, or in their favorite magazine. It is noteworthy that during the last six months, the clergy have drawn much of their inspiration from the sort of play which the man about town terms "raw." "A special performance, with supper, will be given on December 23 at the Kemble," announced the *Chicago Tribune*, "for the clergymen of the neighborhood, who will be expected 'to boost the show' later from their pulpits." If the Chicago clergy resemble many of their brethren of the East, the expectations of the "dubious" theatrical managers will not be disappointed.

The author of "Dear Enemy," Miss Jean Webster, has been quoted or misquoted as saying that "the methods of the majority of orphan asylums unfit the child to go out into the world and meet the problems which necessarily confront him." If the phrase "majority of" be replaced by "very many" or "too many," Miss Webster's statement is undoubtedly true. "Imagine what will happen to these children," writes Miss Webster, "when they are turned out in the world at the age of sixteen to earn their own living. They don't even know how to buy a pair of shoes for themselves." The example of the sixteen-year-old boy who on his entrance into public life, after six years in an orphan asylum, did not know the difference between a twenty-five cent piece and a silver dollar, has been repeated in many parts of the country. None know better than those who are giving their lives to these unfortunate children, the shortcomings of the system which they are obliged to administer. But they are facing not a nice theory, but a very sordid actuality. The theory is, that every child should receive an individual care and attention closely reproducing home conditions. The actuality is that, in order to rescue little waifs from the streets, many orphan asylums are forced to overcrowd. On the other hand, it is unfortunately true that a few Catholic institutions are not making the most of opportunities which they already enjoy. One Catholic establishment, for instance, buys its bread from a bakery conducted by the boys of a city home, although it might teach this useful art to its own boys; and not one of its many acres of good farm land has ever been touched by a plow. So far as Catholic institutions are concerned, the remedy lies in a more generous financial support by the Catholic community, and in greater care in selecting members of the Orphans' Board. The age has passed, if it ever existed, when a good intention qualified for membership in this body. The needs of the day call for men who know what is to be done for these little brothers and sisters of Christ, and can devote time and energy to the fulfilment of the difficult task.

The energetic and courageous Abbot of Caldey whose monastery was reduced to extreme poverty by the war, has inaugurated a school for the education of boys, which resembles in some slight measure, the famous monastery schools of an earlier age. He has taken under his care, free of all charge, a group

of lads who will be trained "for gardening, poultry, and farm work," "stained glass window making" and so on. The boys will also be provided "with regular courses of lectures and instructions," so that they may go from their island-home thoroughly equipped for the battle of life. The Abbot writes of the boys' summer routine as follows:

In summer time, they rise in the morning when the Angelus rings, which is always about half an hour before the first Low Mass at 6.15. They all come to Mass, and most of them make their daily Communion. At seven they have a good solid breakfast, and go to their various works at eight. They "knock off" at twelve and have dinner, for which the Monastery supplies the principal dishes. Then they have a free time for games until two, when they go to work till six o'clock, with a break of half an hour for tea at four. At seven they have supper and recreation, and at nine they go to bed. On Sundays and greater Feasts they come to the High Mass at nine o'clock and to Benediction and Compline in the evening; and on these days also, instead of having meals at St. Joseph's, they come into our Refectory at the Monastery for dinner and supper. This is a change for them, and they like to listen to the reading during the silent meal, while the Monks are glad to see them at their table at the end of the Refectory, and to feel that the boys form part of the established order of things at Caldey. Saturday is a half holiday, and after a thorough clean up of their house they are free to enjoy themselves. We have a big and safe boat for them to row about in Priory Bay, and they will be encouraged to bathe and to fish, and generally to delight themselves with the "objects upon the sea shore" that are dear to the heart of all boys.

There is a wholesome touch of medievalism about this which is truly Benedictine. Play, work, religion, hospitality are all combined in that easy, natural way which makes the "Middle Ages" appear a time of romance to the sad-faced, money-grabbing men and women of this iron and steel age.

Secretary Lane, in his Annual Report, repeats a previous recommendation "that the Bureau of Education should either be abolished or put to serious high purpose." As if in answer to this criticism, the Commissioner of Education, in a recent news-letter, thus "defines the task of the Bureau":

To serve as a clearing-house for accurate and comprehensive information in respect to all educational agencies and all forms of education in the United States and foreign countries, and to disseminate this information among school officers, teachers, students of education, and all others directly interested in education.

To serve as a clearing-house for the best opinions on school organization and administration, courses of study, methods of teaching, and any other matters connected with popular education.

To give advice, on request, to legislatures, school officers, teachers, and others engaged in promoting and directing education.

To promote on its own initiative and to assist education officers and the people of the several States and local communities in promoting what it believes to be necessary and desirable tendencies in education and in the organization of educational agencies, to the end that there may be full and equal opportunity of education for all.

To determine standards of measurement in education and to conduct and direct experiments in education, to the end that we may finally have a larger body of definite scientific knowledge about education and educational processes and methods.

The Commissioner is careful to note that "the Bureau has no administrative functions, other than those connected with the expenditure of funds appropriated by the Federal Government for State colleges of agriculture and mechanics, or for Alaska," but declares that the Bureau "performs higher and more important duties than could be performed by any administrative educational office." These words are somewhat ambiguous. Do they imply disapproval of the plan urged by many, to confer "administrative powers" on the Bureau?